

SALVATION

BY

JESUS CHRIST

ALONE,

(As it is expressly laid down in the
SCRIPTURES)

Agreeable to the

Rules of Reason,

And to the

Laws of Justice.

The Whole intermixed with several
Practical Reflections, directing and per-
suading to a *Christian Life*.

To which is added,

A *Short Inquiry* into the State of Those
Men in a Future Life, who never heard
of *Jesus Christ the Saviour* in This Life.

By *THO. STARNOE*, Minister of the
United Parishes of *Christ-Church* and *St. Leo-
nard Foster-lane*, London.

LONDON, Printed for *Benj. Tooke* at the
Middle-Temple Gate in *Fleet-street*, and sold
by *John Jones* at the *Bell* in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard. MDCC.



To the Right Reverend
FATHER in GOD,
NICOLAS
LORD BISHOP
OF
CHESTER.

MY LORD,

IT was my *early* and *great* Happiness, that I was *then* a Member of *Trinity-College*, when You were an Eminent Guide to the Studies of the *Youth* there. For, tho'

A 2

You

The Dedication.

You were not my appointed Tutor ; yet it so fell out, that for Two Years together (a Thing perhaps scarce known in the College, but at that Time) the great and daily Burden of the Philosophy-Lecture was laid upon *You* : And (for which I do to this Day bless the Divine Providence) those Two Years fell in with that Time, in which *my* Standing in the House obliged me to attend those *Lectures*. And, whatever other Influence they had on me ; This I can with Truth avow, That from *that* Time I always carried in my Breast an *Honour* and *Respect* for Your *Person*.

This I therefore tell Your Lordship, because (I believe) You could not have known it without my Information. For, the beneficial Influence of very useful Men diffuses it self farther, than their own Observation reaches : And some Few
chuse

The Dedication.

chuse that it *should* do so. And I am not so much a Stranger to *Your Lordship*, as not to know, that *You* have a chief Place *among* those Few. But then withal, I beg leave to add, That tho' it be a Noble Temper in *Your Lordship* to *overlook* Your Good Deeds to *others*; yet that will not *excuse* those others, if *they* should do so too: For, Ingratitude is not the *less*, but the *more* Criminal, where there is no Expectation of *Requital*. For which Reason, I have rather adventured to trespass upon Your *Lordships* Goodness, than to forfeit all Title to Goodness *my self*, by offering to You some of those Fruits, which do very much owe themselves to Your early Watering and Cultivation.

But tho' these Your *early* Benefits were (I believe) unknown to Your Self; yet I am sure, that some *later* ones are not: Tho' withal I know,

The Dedication.

that You would have them be so to others. You cannot but remember, (I am sure, I cannot) how affectionately You did *desire* my advantageous Settlement in this City, and how zealously You did *prosecute* such Your Desire both with Your Interest and Assiduity, till You made it appear, that You did *more* than barely desire it. And I own it to the World, that my First Preferment in *London* I obtained by Your Means.

And these Your Kindnesses You still pursued with a condescending Friendship, by which I was blessed with the Freedom and Benefit of Your Conversation, that is, with an Advantageous *Assistance* in my *Studies*, and with an Advantageous *Example* of a sincere *Piety*. The Faults therefore of what I here offer to Your Lordship and the World, I do with Shame take to my self:
For,

The Dedication.

For, they might have been prevented, had I carefully followed my Copy.

But there seems to be a Fatality in Humane Frailty ; and therefore Imitations always fall short of their Originals. But still I reverence what I cannot transcribe ; and so will every *Christian*, who knows Your Lordship, and loves our Lord *Jesus Christ* in sincerity. For, a good Part of the Nation can bear You witness, that You have with an hearty Affection, and with an unwearied Diligence, imployed Your self in that Work (of which he is the Master-Builder) that is, of building up *Christians* in their most Holy Faith, and of edifying them to Salvation. May His Grace make Your Success equal to Your Labours ; and may Your Example provoke other His Messengers to an Imitation of Your Practices. His exalt-

The Dedication.

ing You to such a Station, where Your Example is more visible, and its Influence more powerful, adds Faith to such my Wishes ; and Your great Candor and Integrity (which are Insinuating and Victorious Virtues) do increase such my Faith. For, I do confess, I have my self felt Your Influence ; and because we are apt to judge other Men by our selves, I can the more easily believe, that others may do so too. God grant, that they may do so without my Defects ; of which so many *Instances* as the following Discourse may offer to the *Severity* of Your *Judgment*, so many fresh *Occasions* it will also afford for the *Exercise* of Your *Candor* : For, what the *First* may condemn, the *Last* may pardon ; and tho' You do not *allow* my *Performance*, yet You may *accept* my *Endeavours*. However, I desire You to believe, that what I here offer to Your Lordship is designed
as

The Dedication.

as a Publick Testimony of that
great Reverence I have for Your
Person, Piety, and Learning; and
of those Acknowledgments which
are due for Your great and past
Favours to,

MY LORD,

Your Lordships sincere

and humble Servant,

THO. STAYNOE.

TO

TO THE
READERS.

BEfore I enter upon the Discourse it self, I have something to offer to Two sorts of Readers. First, To those who deny the Doctrine proposed: Secondly, To those who own it.

They of the First sort, to whom I shall address my self, are either the Sober and the Serious, or else the Vicious and Profane.

Now the First of these, when they depreciate our Saviour's Person, and deny his Purchase, do undertake to do so from Grounds of Natural Reason. For, tho' they pretend to acknowledge Revelation in the Case,
yet

To the Readers.

yet that is but a Pretence ; because it is notorious, that they will not allow such Revelation to speak its own Sense, where it does not speak theirs. For, they do so far make their Natural Reason the Measure of Divine Truth, as to believe no such Truth any farther than it falls in with such their Reason : And so the Revelation comes to be believed, not because it is acknowledged to be Divine, but only because it conforms to such their Measure. And therefore, where their Measure falls short, there the Revelation, tho' it do expressly dissent from them, shall yet, by one Artifice or other, be brought down to comply with it.

And to make what I say appear true, I shall here offer Two Instances of such their Practice, and that too in Two Things which do very much concern our future Discourse, which are, Death, and a Resurrection.

And first, tho' we know by our Natural Reason, that Sin deserves Punishment ; yet
we

To the Readers.

we know only by Revelation, that Death is a Punishment of Sin. And therefore the Heathen, who in this Case had no Revelation to instruct them, had no other Notion of Death, but that it was necessary and natural. And Socinus and his Followers have expressly told us, (and that too in spite of Revelation) That their Notion of it is just the same. They tell us indeed moreover, That tho' Death be natural, yet had Man continued Innocent, God would have over-ruled Nature, and so have secured him from Death. That is, the Holy and Wise God had by the ordinary and regular Frame of Things exposed his Innocent Creature to the greatest Natural Mischief: But then, that such a Disposition of Things might not cast a Blemish upon his Justice, he prevented the Effect of it by his Omnipotence: In plain English, he had ordered Things so, that had not his Omnipotence interposed, the Consequence of such Order had been Injustice. A very honourable Account of God's Justice and Wisdom in his Creation; which is so far from mending the Matter,

To the Readers.

Matter, that it makes it worse. But what better is to be expected, when Man shall by his Natural Reason presume to controul the Revelations of God?

Their Reason then having faultred in giving an Account of the Punishment of Sin; it may upon that score the more easily do so, in giving us an Account of the Pardon of it. For, besides that a Resurrection, which is a Release from Death, the Punishment of Sin, is only made known by Revelation; and therefore they, who say, that Death is Natural, must (if they will agree with themselves) disagree from the Scriptures, and say, That a Resurrection is a Release from a Mischief, which is Natural; but not that it is so from a Punishment, which is Moral: But, I say, besides this; when they come by their Reason to tell us, how a Release from Death comes to be granted; they will not, with the Scriptures, allow such Release to be granted in Consideration of our Saviour's Merits; but will by all Means ascribe it to God's mere Mercy. Now tho'
it

To the Readers.

it be allowed, that the Pardon of Sin comes from God's Mercy ; and that such his Mercy, as it relates to us, is Free, because we can in no wise deserve it ; yet, for all that, such Mercy is not in it self, what they would have it to be, the Effect of God's Free-will alone.

For, God's Mercy, as his Word, (which can best inform us in the Case) and as true and sound Reason, agreeing with such his Word, will tell us, is of Two sorts.

1. His Mercy is in the Scriptures taken for his Bounty ; and from this it is that all his Creatures derive all they are, and all they have : And this his Mercy consists in giving. But then,

2. His Mercy is taken for the Pardon of sinful Man ; and this his Mercy consists in forgiving.

So much Difference then, as there is between Giving and Forgiving ; so much Difference

To the Readers.

ference there is between the First Mercy, and the Second.

Now, by the First Mercy God may (it is confessed) give freely, and in what Measure he pleases: For, he may do what he will with his own, and that according to the unbounded Liberty of his own good Pleasure; which is therefore evident, because he may place a Creature in what Station, and bestow upon it what Endowments and what Happiness he pleases, so far as a Creature, as such, is capable of either. And in this Sense all Creatures have been Partakers of his Mercy.

But that cannot be truly said of that his Mercy, which consists in Forgiving. For, all those Creatures cannot be forgiven, who have not sinned; and all those shall not, that have.

*Tho' therefore the First sort of Mercy be not bounded or limited by God's Justice; yet the Last is: And therefore a Resurre-
ction*

To the Readers.

tion, being a *Forgiveness*, must be so limited and bounded too. For, *Vindictive Justice* is not (as it is but too commonly taken to be, and as will appear more fully in the *Discourse* it self) only a *Negative Justice*; that is, it is not barely not unjust to punish a *Criminal*: But it is and must be a *Positive Justice*; that is, it is unjust not to punish him: Or otherwise, he, who has a just Power of punishing a *Criminal*, may, upon no other Motive, but his own Will and Pleasure, not do it.

To tell us therefore, That God by a *Resurrection* grants a Release from Death, the Punishment of Sin, only upon the Account of his mere Mercy, and that *Jesus Christ* came into the World only to bring the joyful Tydings, and to ratifie the Truth of such his Message by his Death and Resurrection; but that he had nothing to do in the Purchase of such Release; as it does confound God's Bounty with his Pardoning Mercy, (and so is a Deviation from Right Reason) so it goes counter to the express

To the Readers.

Declarations of the Scriptures, and so is a Contradiction to Revelation.

Now the Design of what we have hitherto offered, is, to engage the Men, to whom our present Address is directed, to consider,

1. Whether it be not more rational, to acquiesce in the plain Discoveries, which are made to us by Revelation, concerning the Punishment and Pardon of Sin, than to frame such (as they call them, rational) Surmises of their own concerning either, which do very much differ from, and in some Cases contradict such plain Discoveries?

2. I would desire them likewise seriously to consider, Whether what they call Reason, can possibly have such a large Prospect, and comprehensive Knowledge, as to be a competent Judge of the Congruity of all such Things, which may possibly be discovered by Divine Revelation? For, if it have, then it must be no longer called Reason, but
Omni-

To the Readers.

Omniscience: And if it have not, then it will be an intolerable Presumption to undertake to controul exprefs and acknowledged Revelation by it.

3. I would desire them to consider, in the Third place, Whether they have by their Reason examined the Justice of the Divine Proceedings in the Pardon of Sin (as it is expressly laid down in the Divine Revelations) as far as Reason will go? For, Reason is a Thing capable both of Information and Improvement: And That may not seem rational to a less careful View, which yet may do so to a more strict and critical Examination. And therefore such Plausibilities shall sometimes pass for Truths with what at present is thought Reason, which, when thoroughly sifted, shall be found to be gross Falsities.

4. Lastly, I would desire them to consider, That God in his Revelations concerning Man's Salvation, has not only acquainted us, that he will save Mankind; but has also

To the Readers.

told us, upon what Considerations he will do so. For, if they be once satisfied, that he has revealed the Last, as well as the First, (and by believing the plain and express Revelation, they may be so satisfied) then they may as reasonably expect to be saved without their own Repentance, as they may without their Saviour's Merits; that is, they may be satisfied, that they cannot be saved without both.

And when they have well weighed and considered these Things, it may be hoped, that being already supposed sober and serious, they will also be found so modest, as to permit God to save them in his own Way.

The next sort of Readers, who, as is supposed, may deny the Doctrine delivered, are the Vicious and Profane. For, they who professedly renounce Christianity in their Practice, are easily brought over to renounce it in their Belief: Because it is hard to conceive, that they will allow Salvation to be his Purchase, and at his Disposal,

To the Readers.

posel, who has avowedly declared, that such as themselves shall not be made Partakers of it. And therefore, where profligate Wickedness and Debauchery does abound, it is the less to be wondred, tho' it be the more to be lamented, that Infidelity does so too. Irreligious Practices do naturally produce Irreligious Opinions: And a plausible Cavil against any material Truth in Religion, is by too many thought a sufficient Vindication of a profligate Life.

Now it is notorious at first View, that such Men as these do therefore refuse to believe the Truths of Revealed, because they have first broke through the Obligations of Natural Religion; and that having forsaken their God, they do therefore reject his Christ. Whether they have not been assisted and encouraged so to do, by the Zeal and Abilities of those, whom we have treated as the Sober and the Serious, it concerns them to consider; as it does also, Whether their Attempts to depreciate Revealed Religion, has not proved a great Occasion

To the Readers.

of those Immoralities, which have over-run the Nation, and which equally contradict both Revealed and Natural Religion too. For, it will be found true, that as Immorality does incline Men to condemn God's Revelations, so a Contempt of such Revelations does (and that too in its own Nature) lead Men into Immorality: For, both are indeed a Contempt of God's Word. And I must leave it a Doubt, which of the Two mocks God most, whether he, who pretends to believe a God, but yet will not obey his Word; or he, who pretends to believe Revelation, but yet will not allow such Revelation to acquaint him with any Thing, but what his Reason can comprehend. The first puts a Slight upon his Authority; the last, upon his Omniscience; but both, upon his Honour: And then we may be sure, that both are pernicious to the Welfare of Mens Souls.

And indeed, for these Reasons chiefly I have engaged my self in the present Argument. For, it is a very melancholy Contemplation

To the Readers.

temptation to consider, how many Men in the present Age, who yet call themselves Christians, do professedly renounce that very Faith, into which they were baptized, and that too by their Saviour's express Institution, exhibited to us in Revelation. And he must shut his Eyes, who does not take notice, that the Manners of the Age are no better than its Faith. And in such a Case, I cannot but think it Treachery in a Minister of Jesus Christ, not to interpose in one way, or other. For, not to do it at all, is in effect to betray his Master, to betray his Trust, and to betray the Souls of Men.

The other sort of Readers, whom I would bespeak, and that only in a Word or two, are Those, who tho' they agree with me in the main and principal Conclusions, may yet perhaps differ from me in some subordinate Propositions, which I lay down in my Way to such Conclusions. Now, to such Readers I have this small Request, That they would not think, because I hold the same

To the Readers.

Articles of Faith with them, that therefore I stand bound to take them by the same Philosophical Handle. I believe the Scripture, because I take it to be the Word of God; I believe an Article of Faith, because it is in the Scripture: But when I come to accommodate such Article to Right Reason, I do no more think my self tied up to other Mens Measures, than I think, that they are to be tied up to mine. We may go different Ways, and yet meet in the same Truth: And, which is more, perhaps the Divine Wisdom may make use of such our Differences to take in more Souls, whose Conceptions of Things do so differ, as ours do. And tho' I can say nothing for my Skill, yet I can say thus much for my Sincerity, that I have in all Cases whatsoever followed That, which at present I take to be Truth.

One Thing more I have to add, and that is, That it has been objected, (and may be again) That my Zeal in the Cause appears too late; and that it would
have

To the Readers.

have been more seasonable, had it shewed it self, when Things of this Nature, and (at least) relating to this Subject, were lately and hotly debated from the Press: *And*, That the Business, I undertake, has already been, and that several Times, discussed by Learned Men and Great Names.

But all this, and more, must not weigh with one, who is persuaded, that, notwithstanding all past Endeavours, Infidelity and Immorality do still go on, and gain Ground; and that we ought in Honesty still to apply Remedies, as we find the Contagion spread; and that according to the various Constitutions of the Patients, a less promising sort of Physick may sometimes work a Cure, where a more likely, and that too from a more celebrated Hand, has fallen short. Something more might be said, and that Something true: But I think what is said in short, enough in the Case.

To

To the Readers.

To conclude then ; I would desire every Reader, to lay aside all Prejudice, by whatsoever Means contracted ; - Whether from an Opinion of other Mens great Worth, or a Conceit of their own ; Whether from a Security, that they are already in the Right, or a Shame to retreat, tho' they find themselves in the Wrong ; Whether from Vice, or Carelessness, or from any other Cause whatsoever. And I do solemnly profess, that what I desire them to do in the Reading, that I have all along endeavoured to do in the Writing of the following Discourse. For, I have, as far as my slender Talent goes, had my Eye all along directed to Truth, to the Honour of my Great Lord and Master, and to the Good of Souls. And may his Grace, which is alone able to do it, make it effectual for those Great and Holy Purposes : That so Men may be persuaded, not to be so foolishly wicked, as to entertain cheap Thoughts of, and much less to revile
and

To the Readers.

and blaspheme Him, in whose Hand is lodged all Power in Heaven and Earth, who shall be their Judge, and who alone must be their Saviour. And it is this Last Proposition which the following Discourse attempts to make good.

THE



THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Scriptures do most expressly assert,
That Mankind are redeemed by the
Blood of Jesus Christ. It is not agreeable
to the Divine Wisdom, or to the Method of
his Proceedings in the like Cases, to employ
greater Means to bring his Purposes to pass,
where less may be sufficient. Punishment is
the necessary Wages of Sin. An Objection to
this Position answered. Page 13

CHAP. II.

The Gospel holds forth no such thing, as an
Absolute or Unconditional Pardon; no, nor
yet an Arbitrary Pardon. 32

CHAP. III.

A Gospel-Salvation contains in it, 1. Pardon
of Sin. 2. The Gift of Eternal Happiness.
To these, Two other Things required: 1. An
Expiation of Sin. 2. A Restitution to Ho-
liness. Negatively, the several Ways how
such Expiation cannot be made; from whence
an Inference of the Doctrine asserted, with
some Practical Inferences. 36

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. IV.

That Person to whom the Expiation of Sin is by the Scriptures ascribed, is by the same Scriptures set forth to us, 1. As God; 2. As Man; 3. As God and Man united in one Person, or God Incarnate. No Man a competent Judge of all possible Unions. The Incarnation agreeable to the Sentiments of Mankind, and variously foretold, prefigured, and suggested in the Scriptures. Some Practical Inferences, somewhat enlarged. Pag. 57

CHAP. V.

The Son of God, by his Incarnation, accommodated his Condition for the making good the Expiation of Man's Sin. 96

CHAP. VI.

The Divinity of the Son of God necessary for the Expiation of Man's Sin, as well as his Humanity. Some Doctrinal Inferences. A general Proof, That as our Saviour did actually die, so, that he might justly die for the Expiation of Sin. 113

CHAP. VII.

Answers to Three Objections. 1. The Punishment was in Justice only due to us, not to him. This Objection retorted upon the Socinians. 2. That his Death was but a Temporal Punishment; but the Expiation pretended to be made, was of an Eternal Punishment. 3. The Absurdity, that God should suffer for the Satisfaction of his own Justice.

134

CHAP.

The Contents.

C H A P. VIII.

Bare Pardon of Sin not sufficient for a Gospel-Salvation: Some Reasons offered for it. They, who are entitled to the Reward of the Law, must be entitled to the Obedience paid to the Law. Such Obedience must be perfect. Some Practical Reflections. Pag. 160

C H A P. IX.

Whose that Perfect Obedience is, in Consideration of which, Eternal Happiness is given to Man. That it is our Saviour's. Some Objections answered; and the Doctrine of the Imputation asserted, 1. Against those, who acknowledge the Expiation; 2. Against those, who deny it. This Doctrine agreeable to the Scriptures. 179

C H A P. X.

Some Objections answered, and some Practical Inferences made. 216

C H A P. XI.

The First and General Proposition asserted from all that has been said: That the whole Doctrine of a Gospel-Salvation, as laid down in the Scriptures, is agreeable to the allowed Practices of Mankind in their Legal or Judicial Proceedings; and is worded in the Scriptures accordingly. 233

C H A P. XII.

That besides the Saviour's Righteousness imputed, God will after their Resurrection endow Believers with a perfect, inherent, and eternal

The Contents.

*nal Holiness. How the Saviour did fit and
prepare Men for such an Holiness. Pag. 254*

C H A P. XIII.

*By what Means Men shall be put into the
Actual Possession of Eternal Life. 277*

C H A P. XIV.

*Wherein the Happiness of Eternal Life does
consist. Several Reflections, and Considera-
tions on what has been said, tending to pro-
mote an Holy Life. 297*

E R R A T A.

Page	Line	For	Read
50	2	their Sons	them Son
118	10	naturally	actually

S A L.

SALVATION

BY

JESUS CHRIST

A L O N E.

The INTRODUCTION.

I. **S**alvation implies in the very Notion of it, either the *Prevention* of some Mischief, to which we are *obnoxious*; or a *Deliverance* from some Mischief, which we *actually suffer*. Now because it is our professed Design and Business at present to discourse of the Salvation of Mankind by our Saviour; therefore, in order to our so doing, it will be proper first to consider, what Mischief it is from which they are saved. For the true Knowledge of the *Occasion* and *Nature* of the *Mischief*, will very much assist us in our Enquiries into the *Nature* and *Justice* of such *Salvation*.

We must know therefore, That when God, who made Man, and all Things beside, had placed Man in this lower World; as he did

B

pro-

provide for his *Well-being* by his *Bounty*, so he did provide for his *greater Happiness* by his *Law*. For by the *first* he only put all *Creatures* here in subjection to *Man*; but by the *last*, he acquainted *Man* with his own Subjection to *Himself*. For it is an undoubted Truth, That it is a greater Happiness, to be a true Subject to God, than it is to be Tenant of the whole Earth, and a deputed Lord over all the *Creatures* in it.

Now, in order to some few Remarks, which we shall make upon God's first Law given to Man, and which will open a Way to our main Design; it will be convenient, that we lay down the Law as it was given forth. Thus therefore it stands: *Of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it: For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die; or, as it is in the Original, dying thou shalt die: The Reduplication in that Language being equivalent to an Asseveration in ours. It has been a Doubt among Learned Men, whether this first Law be a Moral, or only a Positive Law. Now for the Resolution of such Doubt, it may not be improper to consider apart, First, What is expressly contained in the Law; and, Secondly, What is implied under such Expression.*

And first, If we only consider the express Words of the Law, which forbid the eating of the Fruit of the Tree specified; the Law
in

in such Case is therefore *Positive*, not *Moral*, because before the Prohibition there was no more Immorality in eating of *that* Tree, than of any *other*.

But then, secondly, If we farther consider, that tho' the Law, as to the particular Thing prohibited, was purely Arbitrary, and therefore so far forth only *Positive*; yet that the Prohibition did imply in it a *Moral Duty*, grounded upon very equitable Considerations; we may conclude, that under this express and *Positive Law*, there is implied and couched a *Moral Law*. For,

First, God gave Man not only his *Being*, but also all Things for the necessary and convenient *Support* of such *Being*: and from thence we may by our Natural Reason inform our selves, that his so doing was a very equitable Consideration, why Man should be bound up in *Gratitude* (and that is as much, as being bound up in *Morality*) to acknowledge the Kindness and Bounty of his Great Benefactor.

Secondly, Man being bound in *Gratitude* to acknowledge the *Kindness* and *Bounty*; we may truly add, that he was farther bound to acknowledge such *Kindness* and *Bounty* in such *Way*, as such his Benefactor should appoint.

Thirdly, God having made the Earth, and all Things in it; he might grant as many, or as few of the Things so made, to Man, as he

himself pleased : And therefore might except any one, or more of them, out of such Grant.

Fourthly, God having an undoubted Power of Reserving to himself what he pleased out of those Things, which he had made; he might in Justice and Equity require, that Man should give one Testimony of his Gratitude, by abstaining from what he should please so to reserve.

Fifthly, God by singling out the Forbidden Tree from all the rest, and by so doing, reserving it to himself, had made that a standing Mark and Signal of his own rightful and supreme *Dominion* over the Whole; as also, for the same Reason, of *Man's Tenure* and *Subjection*.

Sixthly, As we may suppose the Forbidden Tree to have stood in the midst of the Garden, from the Ninth Verse of the Second Chapter of *Genesis*; so a Tree so placed was by its very Situation a very fit and proper Thing to be made use of for such a purpose; because being (in some measure at least) equidistant from the Boundaries of the general Grant, it must for that Reason be most likely to present it self to *Adam's* View, to whatever Part of the Garden he moved; and by so doing must constantly, or at least frequently put him in mind of the Nature of his Tenure, *viz.* that he held it of him, who had settled him in the Possession and Use of
all

JESUS CHRIST *alone.*

5

all the rest. So that, as the Law is *Positive*, if we only look upon the *express* Words of it; so it is *Moral*, if we consider what is implied in it. And therefore, as the *immediate* and *direct* Transgression of the Law was the eating the *forbidden Fruit*; so the *couched Immorality* of such Transgression was an *Usurpation* upon God's *Prerogative* in this lower World, and an Encroachment upon the reserved Rights and Demeans of the Supreme Lord. The Transgression of the *express* Law then was a Sin against God's *Command*: But the Transgression of the *implied* Law was a Sin against his *Natural* and *Supreme Right*. The *first* was a *Sin*, because it did what God had expressly *forbid*: The *last* was implicitly *forbid*, because it was a *Sin*; and therefore was a Sin, tho' God did not expressly forbid it. The *first* was therefore only unlawful, because *forbidden*: The *last* was unlawful in *it self*.

To sum up all in a few Words: Tho' the Designation of the particular Thing, *viz.* the Tree in the midst of the Garden, was Arbitrary, and therefore Positive; yet the Designation of Something was, as Just and Wile, so (I may add) Moral and Necessary too; at least so far as it is so, that God's Supreme Right ought to be asserted and owned. For, so far forth the Prohibition given to Man, of eating of the Fruit of any Tree marked out, or of meddling with any Thing else, is ground-

ed upon the Antecedent and Eternal Rules of Reason and Justice, that is, of Morality.

And therefore, tho' the *express* Prohibition of the Law be only *Positive*; yet the *Reason* of the Prohibition is at least so far *Moral*, as it is so, That Man, by some Means or other, should acknowledge God to be his Supreme Lord, and that he receives from him whatsoever he enjoys; and that if God do expressly appoint the Way and Means of his so doing, he ought to do it by the Way and Means so appointed.

And I therefore say (*expressly*) because so far as the Words of the Law under our present Consideration do go, it is notorious, that what is *expressly* prohibited by it, is only *Arbitrary* and *Positive*: But that the *Morality* of the Prohibition is *not* expressed, but (at the most) but *couched* and *implied*.

By what has been spoken, we may learn,

1. That the Sin expressly prohibited by the Law may therefore truly be esteemed a lesser Sin, because it is only a Sin against a Positive Law. For, such a Sin is a Sin only against God's Authority: Whereas a Sin that contains a Natural Immorality in it (if I may so speak) is a Sin both against God's Authority, and against his Purity and Holiness too.

2. That the express Penalty of the Law is only a Punishment threatned against the Transgression of the express Prohibition of the Law. For it does not look like Justice,

to assign an exprefs Punishment in the Law, for the Transgression of any Thing, which is not exprefsly contained in the Law.

3. Such Punishment so threatned against the Transgression of the exprefs Law, is exprefs, absolute, and peremptory. *Adam* then did therefore fatally suffer the Penalty of the Law, because he sinned against an exprefs Prohibition, which was ratified by an absolute, peremptory, and exprefs Threat. For God may therefore be thought to be obliged by his Truth to punish *Adam's* Transgression according to the exprefs Threat of the Law, because he had passed his more solemn Word, that he would do so. And as he was obliged by his Truth to punish it as the Law had threatned; so he was obliged to punish it, because it was a Sin: For so, undoubtedly, is the Transgression of any of God's Laws.

From hence it may be concluded, that we all die a temporal Death for *Adam's* Sin. For, as we were in the Loins of him in the day of his Transgression; so God has not by any other Law assigned an Universal Mortality as the Punishment of Sin. And so speaks the Scripture; *In Adam all died.*

4. As the Moral Law couched in the Positive Law is not exprefs, so neither is there any exprefs Punishment threatned to the Transgression of such couched Law. For while Man was in a State of Innocence, as there was no need that God should prescribe

him any exprefs Law to guide him in fuch Things, which were in their own Nature good; becaufe the dictates of his own reafon were of themfelves fufficient for fuch his guidance (for Moral Goodnefs is nothing elfe, but the Dictates of right Reafon employed about the Actions of Rational Creatures): So, for the fame Reafon, there was no occafion to threaten him in that Cafe with any exprefs Penalty; becaufe the threatening of an exprefs Penalty antecedent to the Commiffion of the Crime, can only be proper there, where there is an exprefs Law commanding a Duty: Whereas Man had never by his Reafon known, that it had been a Sin to eat of any Fruit, which kindly offer'd it felf to his View, and natural Inclinations, if fuch Fruit had not been forbidden by fome exprefs Law. And therefore, for the fame Reafon, that it was neceffary, that fuch Law fhould be exprefs; it was neceffary, that the Penalty of fuch Law fhould be exprefs too.

5. As the Sin againft the Moral Duty, which is only implied in the Law (were that Duty fupposed to be exprefs Law) is greater than the Sin againft the exprefs, but Positive Law; fo (were there a Punifhment to be exprefsly assigned to fuch Sin) it muft in Juftice be greater than the Punifhment assigned to the lefs Sin, that is, to the Transgreffion of the Positive Law. The Punifhment therefore assigned by the exprefs Law to the Transgreffion

sion of it, being only Death, and that too (as appears from the Nineteenth Verse of the Third Chapter of *Genesis*) a temporal Death; our Reason, and that natural Sense we have of the Proportions of Justice, will assure us, that the Law, which forbids a greater Sin, than this Law does, must in Reason and Equity assign an heavier Punishment to such greater Sin.

6. Such heavier Punishment must suppose a Resurrection. For, a greater Punishment than Death cannot therefore be inflicted upon a dead Man, without a Resurrection; because no Punishment at all can be so inflicted upon him. For where there is no Sensation, there can be no Punishment; and a dead Man can have no Sensation, unless we could suppose him to be alive, and dead at the same time. This Head may meet with Objections; but I shall wave them, and any Answer to them, at present; and that too so much the rather, because it is notorious, that the Scriptures do lay the greater Punishment, that is, the Punishment greater than Death, not only beyond the Resurrection, but also beyond the last Judgment it-self.

7. Lastly: In such Places of Scripture, where the greater Punishment is threatned, it is not (as the Punishment of the Transgression of the Positive Law was) absolute and peremptory, but only conditional. And therefore if we except, *first*, the Sin against the Holy

Holy Ghost, (whatever that be; for it does not concern us to enquire at present); and, *secondly*, The Refusing the Conditions of Salvation offered in a Saviour, that grand and comprehensive Sin, which either neglects or renounces the only Means appointed for Man's Salvation from all his other Sins; I say, if we except these Two Cases (if yet they be Two) not only the future Punishment threatned against the Breach of this or that Law, but of any, or all, may (as far as the Gospel-discoveries go) be remitted.

Which may teach us to think, that the Punishment threatned in the Law given to *Adam*, was not a Punishment after a Resurrection, but a Punishment without a Resurrection. And that, not only because at that Time, when the Law was given to him, there was not only no Resurrection promised; but no Saviour neither, by whom alone a Resurrection was to be brought to pass. To which we may add, That the Death threatned to *Adam* by the Law given to him, was (as we have seen) upon his Transgression of such Law, absolute and peremptory; and that the Execution of such Threat is (as the Scripture and our Experience tells us) absolute and universal. Whereas the Threat of an eternal Death, as we are well assured, is, upon the Breach of God's Laws, only conditional. Now it looks hard to our Reason, that when only Death is threatned in the Law,

Law, and that Death at the very most but indefinite, to say, that the Death so threatened does imply a double Death, that is, both a Temporal and Eternal Death. And it looks harder yet, to say, that the Threat and Execution of one of the Deaths is absolute and universal; but that the Threat and Execution of the other is only partial and conditional. For our Reason tells us, that neither any Threat nor Execution of Death can be both Absolute and Conditional; both Universal and Particular too.

From the Whole we take notice, That tho God was obliged both by his Truth and Justice to execute the Threatning against the Transgression of the first Law; because that Law being given to Man in his Innocence, (that is, before he stood in need of a Saviour, and therefore before God had promised one) the Threat of Punishment upon the Breach of the Law was (as we have seen) absolute and peremptory: Yet because the Revelation of a future and everlasting Punishment in the New Covenant, is rather made by way of Information, than by way of peremptory Threat, and absolute Denunciation; therefore God is obliged to the Execution of such Penalty only by his Justice, but not at all by his Veracity.

If then there be a Means provided to satisfy such his Justice, without the rigorous Execution of such declared, and (without
such

such Means) certain Penalty; it will well enough follow, That such Penalty may be remitted, without any Prejudice either to his Justice, or to his Truth. And therefore, in what is to follow, we trust to make it good, That our Lord and Saviour *JESUS CHRIST* may and will justly save us from the Punishment peremptorily threatned to *Adam*, (*viz.* the Loss of Life executed upon him and all Mankind) by releasing us from it after we have suffer'd it; and from a future and eternal Punishment (expresly revealed in the New Testament to *Christians*, and probably also after the Fall of *Adam*, and the Promise of the Seed of the Woman, believed by the Patriarchs, and by God's Church among the *Jews*) by preventing it.

CHAP. I.

The Scriptures do most expressly assert, That Mankind are redeemed by the Blood of JESUS CHRIST. It is not agreeable to the Divine Wisdom, or to the Method of his Proceedings in the like Cases, to employ greater Means to bring his Purposes to pass, where less may be sufficient. Punishment is the necessary Wages of Sin. An Objection to this Position answered.

AND as we have grounded what we have said in the *Introduction* upon the Revelations of God, which have acquainted us how Sin, and the Punishment of it, Death, entered into the World: So, in what is to follow concerning the Redemption of Mankind both from Sin and Punishment, we shall take our Rise from Revelation likewise: Not only because we had known nothing of the Matter, but by Revelation; but also because, in the present Case, Revelation is undoubtedly the best Guide of our Reason. For, Reason must of necessity be guided best by that, without the Guidance of which, Reason it self is confessedly blind. And we are very sure, that it becomes all those, who acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Revelations of God; I say, it becomes them, in modesty
and

and deference to the Author, and in prudence for their own more certain Conduct, rather to endeavour to bring their Reason to comply with the Revelation, than to bring the Revelation to comply with their Reason. And therefore that we our selves may practise what we cannot but judge to be best in the Practice of others, we shall lay the Ground-work of all that is to follow, upon the Words of St. Peter, in the Fourth of the Acts and the Twelfth Verse; *Neither is there Salvation in any other: For there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved.* In which Words the Apostle, and he too at that time filled with the Holy-Ghost (as appears by the Eighth Verse) does expressly tell us (for the Words do import so much) That Men must be saved by *JESUS CHRIST* of Nazareth, (consult the Tenth Verse) and by no other.

For it is evident, that by *Name* in the Text is meant *Jesus Christ* himself; because what he calls [*Name*] in one Part of the Verse, is opposed to [*any other*] in the other Part of the Verse: As in the Tenth Verse he tells us, *that the impotent Man was made whole by the [Name] of Jesus Christ*, in the beginning; and that *he was made whole by [Him]*, that is, by *Jesus Christ*, in the latter end of the Verse.

Those who professedly and avowedly make it their Business to evacuate the Purchase of

Our

Our Saviour's Merits and Blood, do to that purpose start, if not an impertinent, yet a very sawcie Question; which is, Whether or no God could not have saved sinful Man by some other Means, than by the Death of his Son? And by that means would alter that very Question, (which they alone have made a Question) *viz.* Whether *Jesus Christ* died for the Sins of Men? I say, they would alter it into another Question, neither fit to be disputed, nor possible to be determined by short-sighted Men; *viz.* What God can do, and what God cannot do? Whereas it is sufficient for us to take Things as we find them; and if we find, that Things in the present Case are so ordered by God, and that he tells us, that they are so, as that sinful Man shall not obtain Redemption but only by the Merits and Death of *Jesus Christ* their Saviour: I say, if God tells us, and that too by repeated Declarations, that Things in the present Case are so ordered; we ought to acquiesce in such his Declarations, and not employ our Vanity or Curiosity (for it can in no sober Sense be call'd our Reason) in enquiring *Whether*, much less in determining *that they might or might not* have been better ordered. But of this more hereafter.

At present therefore, and in the first place, we shall take the Matter of Fact to be just as the Scriptures have in most plain and express Words told us it is; That *Jesus Christ* died
for

for our Sins ; that he died to save Sinners, &c. And then, by comparing this Matter of Fact with other the Methods of the Divine Proceedings in the like Cases, see if it will not afford us a very plausible Argument of the Truth laid down, *That there is not Salvation in any other.*

Now if we carry our Observation through any other the Transactions of the Divine Love and Mercy, that do design to entitle Men to the same Salvation, we shall find, that God does never make use of extraordinary Means, where the ordinary are sufficient. And therefore, when the Lord himself appeared to *Saul* in his Journey to *Damascus*, we find, that the Design and Effect of that Vision was to refer him to *Ananias* for Instructions in his Duty. And so when the Angel appeared to *Cornelius*, the Business of his Message was only to direct him to *Peter*, that so *Peter* might by the ordinary Means of Grace direct him into the Way of Salvation. And when Men have *Moses* and the Prophets, it will therefore concern them in Duty and Interest to hear them, because in such Case God will not convince them by raising one from the Dead. In short, as it is not the Method of the Divine Proceedings, so neither is it of Wisdom it self, to let the Measure of the Means exceed in their Proportion to the designed End. And in any Case whatsoever, where less Cost or Labour is sufficient, there
common

common Prudence will by no means *allow*, and much less *approve* our Drudgery or Profuseness. Now to bring what we have said to our present purpose :

Since our Saviour, for the Establishment of the Gospel-Covenant, did actually take upon him Our Flesh, and in that Flesh suffer; it will afford us no slight Argument, that That Covenant could not have been established upon more easie Conditions; because our common Reason does assure us, that all Excess of Performance in the Case would have been Superfluity: And our Religion and Modesty does forbid us to fasten any such Imputation upon the Divine Counsels and Actions. And here we may well put *Abraham's Question*, *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right?* And when by the purpose of his Mercy he determined to rescue fallen Man from Sin and Misery, shall he reject the Son of his Bosom, and expose him to all sorts of Misery in this World, and to Violence and Barbarity in his Departure out of it; when the Ransom might have been made at a cheaper Rate? Certainly the Love of God is not so narrow and stinted, but that he both could and would have extended it to his lost Creatures, and yet at the same time not have removed it from his only and beloved Son, if Justice and Wisdom had allowed him so to do. But then, because he himself tells us, that he did otherwise; and because

we know, that what he tells us, must be true; as well as, that what he does, is just and holy; therefore the Conclusion, that fairly offers it self, is, That nothing less than the Incarnation, and Death of the Son of God could in Wisdom and Justice have brought about the designed Redemption. To which we shall in short add, That it is one of the certain Characters of the True God, that he brings his Purposes to pass by the best, wisest, and most proper Means.

And now having thus opened our Way to our main Design, by these few Reflexions on the Matter of Fact, as it is laid down most expressly in the Scriptures: We shall in what follows go on to consider the Merits of the Cause; and that we shall do, by examining, Whether or no Mankind had not brought themselves into so forlorn a Condition by their Sin, that there does not appear in Justice any probable, or indeed any possible Way for their Salvation, but only by the Incarnation and Death of the Son of God.

And that there did not, will (I presume) appear, when we have considered and confirmed the following Propositions; whereof the

First is, *That Misery and Death, or, in one word, that Vengeance is, as the Just, so also the Necessary Wages of Sin.*

And here, before we begin, to prevent, as much as possible, all Objections that may be
started

started against what we shall deliver, we must desire the Reader to take notice, that we do at present only make it our Business to measure the Equity of the Punishment of Sin by the exact and rigorous Laws of Justice: That is, we do (as we must, if we will do right) conceive Things in that State, in which they had stood, had the Son of God never been designed for the Saviour of the World. For, because our Business at present is to enquire, what would have become of sinful Man, if the Son of God had not interposed for his Rescue; therefore we stand obliged at present to take other Measures in accounting for the Proceedings of the Divine Justice, than what our Experience acquaints us with in this World. For while we live here, we come within the *Compass*, and so enjoy the *Benefit* of that Relaxation of the Law, which was the Purchase of our Saviour's Merits; and therefore we cannot truly pass a Judgment upon the exact Proceedings of the Divine Justice, from the Contemplations of those Proceedings of Justice which we see in this World, and which, upon that account, come within the compass of that Relaxation. To know therefore, whether the Incarnation, Life, and Death of our Saviour were necessary for Man's Redemption, we must enquire, what had become of sinful Man, if the Son of God had not become his Saviour. And if upon that Enquiry it shall appear, that Ven-

geance without any Remedy had been his Portion ; then it will also appear (at least) a probable Conclusion (for we shall adventure no farther, because we are utter Strangers to the unsearchable Depths of the Divine Wisdom) That Mankind had brought themselves into so forlorn a Condition by their Sin, that there does not appear to us any possible or just Way for their Redemption, but only by the Incarnation, Life, and Death of their Revealed Saviour, the Son of God.

This Caution then being laid down, and well observed, the First Proposition, *viz. That Punishment or Vengeance is the Just and Necessary Wages of Sin*, will appear more easie and rational.

And for asserting the Truth of it, we lay it down in the

1. First place, *That God is in his own Nature Holy*. This does necessarily fall in with our very Notion of a God ; because it is a Contradiction to our very Conceptions of a Deity, to suppose any Wickedness or Turpitude in him.

2. We lay it down, secondly, *That God loves himself*. This will easily be allowed, for more Reasons than one ; both because the Notion is Natural and Universal, that all Living Things do so ; as also because God cannot but be supposed to be the most Noble and Adequate, as well as Natural Object (if I may so speak) of his own Love. Nay, some Men

Men have streined this Point so far, as to tell us, that the great and infinite Complacency that God takes in himself, and in his own Perfections, would never have allowed him to condescend to his Work of Creation, and by that Means to have allowed any of his Love and Good-will to low, mean, and inferiour Creatures (as the best of Creatures are, if compared to him) if the Son, who is the Word of God, had not interposed upon that Occasion ; and so they make him a Mediator of Creation, as well as of Redemption. But laying that aside at present, as being nothing to our purpose ; it may suffice for our Design, that whatever Love God bears to his Creatures, it cannot be supposed, but that he not only loves, but that he does also chiefly, and in the first place, love himself.

These Two Things then being laid down, *That God loves himself* ; and, *That he is in his Nature Holy* ; the Inference that we shall make, before we proceed any farther, must be, That he cannot otherwise chuse but hate and abhor whatsoever is contrary to such his Nature : And, because all Sin and Wickedness is so ; that therefore he cannot chuse but hate and abhor all Sin and Wickedness. And hence it is, that the Scripture acquaints us, that *the carnal mind is enmity with God* ; that is, all Sin and Wickedness is so. For we may as rationally conceive, that a Man, who entertains and makes much of Sin, does love

God; as we may, that God, who in his Nature is Holy, can love Sin, which is directly contrary to such his Holiness. This Inference then, from the Two former Propositions, being thus in short laid down, and made good; we go on, and add in the

3. Third place, *That the Life and Happiness of all God's Creatures is only the Effect of the Divine Good-will and Pleasure.* For undoubtedly, *it was he that made us, and not we our-selves.* And taking it for granted at present, that he did so; I would in the next place enquire, Whether we did deserve such our Beings, or not? If it be answered, That we did not; then we have what we desire, and that is, that the great and first Blessing, that ever God bestowed upon us, was by him freely bestowed, without any possible Merit in us; and therefore, that it was the free Effect of his Good-will and Pleasure. But if any Man shall be so silly, as to think, that he could deserve his Being of God; then to make good such his Conceit, it will be expected (and that too, for ever; for the Expectation will never be answered) that he should make it out, that Nothing may have Something of Merit in it; and, that what as yet is not, may have wherewithal to lay an Obligation upon Omnipotence.

And as our Being was the free Effect of the Divine Good-will and Pleasure; so also are all those Blessings which do attend it. For
with

with our Beings he did also bestow upon us all those Faculties, which should entertain any other Thing whatsoever. And as he made our Faculties, so did he all Things else, which can possibly gratifie those Faculties. And that there is any Harmony or Agreement between those Faculties, and their Objects, is undoubtedly owing to him, who was the original Contriver and Author of both. And therefore in the

4. Fourth place, I would offer it to Consideration, *That it is only the Exercise of God's Good-will towards us, that does indeed and truth make way for the Exercise of his Justice upon us*; Because we could never have undergone the Severity of the last, if we had never been made Partakers of the Bounty of the first: And therefore, when God does punish us for our Sins by his Justice, that Punishment does nothing else, but only strip us of something, which we had before received from his Mercy. And this, upon a serious Consideration, will appear to be true, whether the Punishment inflicted do deprive us of our Ease, Peace, Safety, or even of Life itself. For, *what have we, that we did not receive*; since *in him we live, and move, and have our Being*?

5. Fifthly, I would offer it to Consideration, Whether when God takes any Thing from us, which, upon the account of his Good-will and Pleasure, he had bestowed upon us; I say,

Whether in such a Case the true and just Reason, why he does so, is not, because we by our Sins have turned such his Good-will towards us, into his Displeasure against us? For, if what he bestowed was the Effect of his Good-will; and if (as God made us holy and upright at first) he cannot but continue the same Good-will towards us, so long as we continue as he made us: Then we may be assured, that so long as he continues such his Good-will towards us, so long he will continue the Effects of such his Good-will too. And if we were not assured of this, then it might be all one as to us, whether God were well-pleased with us, and loved us, or not. For, if the Loss of such good Things, which are the Effects of God's Good-will to us, may (while we continue holy and innocent) be once made consistent with such his Good-will; then farewell to all Distinction as to the Justice of Rewards and Punishments: For, in such a Case it may be the same thing, whether we please God, or displease him; because we may lose the Effects of his Favour, that is (according to the Tenor of the last Head) we may be punished as well for our Innocence, as for our Wickedness; or, at the very best, we may be punished for Nothing. No! no! As God's Displeasure is contrary to his Good-will and Favour; so the Effects and Consequences of that Displeasure must be contrary to the Effects and Consequences of such his

his Good-will and Favour too. This is the Voice of Nature, and this the Voice of Justice; and therefore also this is the Voice of Truth. And then, as we shewed before, that all the good Things, that we do or can enjoy, did proceed purely and meerly from God's Good-will; so I do now add, that our Sins do naturally turn that Good-will into Displeasure; and then the Good-will ceasing, all those Emanations, that flowed from it, must in course cease also. And then, because where they cease, there the Sinner's Punishment does begin; therefore we may now from the Whole begin to perceive, that the Punishment of Sin is not so arbitrary a thing, as it is usually taken to be; but that it does, when traced to the beginning, depend upon the same Necessity, by which God loves himself. For, if we sum up all our Discourse upon this Head from the beginning, we shall understand, That God loves himself; That he is in his own Nature Holy; That therefore he hates whatsoever is contrary to such his Nature; That all Sin therefore is so, because it is contrary to his Holiness; That the Effects of his Hatred must be contrary to those of his Love; or, at the very best, That the Emanations of his Love must then be stopped, when that Love is turned into Hatred and Displeasure; That when his Creatures lose those Emanations, then their Misery begins; That all those Creatures must
needs

needs lose them, that lose that Love, from whence alone they do proceed ; and, That they lose that Love by their Sins ; because (as we said before) Sin, and Sin alone, does turn it into Hatred and Displeasure. So that (if we may be allow'd so to speak in Morality) there is an essential Relation between Sin and Punishment ; and the Necessity of Punishment (when narrowly scann'd) is founded upon the eternal and immutable Laws of Truth, Holiness, and Justice.

But before we leave this Head, I would (if that be possible) make all a little plainer by an Instance : And that Instance shall be in that Punishment, which the first Sin brought upon the whole Race of Mankind. And I do the rather take my Instance there, because the Law was given and broken, and so the Penalty both threatned and incurred, when there was no Saviour to remit the rigorous but just Execution of such Penalty.

Now we are assured by the Reason of the Thing it-self ; (as we have already discoursed) But if that will not do, we are assured by God's Word, by his Promise, by his Oath, that he neither *wills*, nor *delights in the death of a Sinner*. And when he swears so to us, it would be both proper and modest in us to believe, that there is something in Sin, which does oblige God in Justice (and that is the same thing with God, as to be obliged by Necessity) to punish it with Death. And to
this

his purpose we may take notice, that it is derogatory to God's Honour, for us to resolve any Punishment, which we suffer, into God's Will only, and not into his Justice. Because (as we shall presently perceive) when God wills the Death of a Sinner, he therefore only wills it, because Justice does require it, and that (in the Nature of the Thing) antecedently to such his Will. For, if the Death of a Man should be therefore just, only because God wills it, tho' the Man do not deserve it; then it may be all one as to the Event, and that justly too, whether a Man were perfectly innocent, or the most profligate Miscreant upon the Face of the Earth. For, according to that Doctrine, which we now oppose, God might in such a Case justly will the Death of the Innocent, and save the Criminal alive. For, if the ultimate Resolution of the Justice of our Death be only into the Will of God, then nothing can hinder, but that God may justly slay a perfect Innocent. And so when God told *Adam*, that in the day of his Transgression he should surely die; the Meaning of his Threat must have been, that he might have died, whether he had transgressed or not. But because we cannot without Blasphemy tax God's Law of such notorious Prevarication; therefore we must determine, that the ultimate Resolution of *Adam's* Punishment in such Case, must be into the Desert of such Punish-

Punishment by the Breach of the Law, and that God's willing his Death was a just Consequent of such his Desert. In short ; God wills such things only; which he can will justly ; and he, who will rationally, and truly account for the Proceedings of God, in that and such like Cases, must have a care to do it so, as to maintain the Harmony of all his Attributes. He must not magnifie his Power, no nor his Mercy so, as to impeach his Truth, Wisdom, and Justice : For he, who confounds the Events of Innocence and Guilt, will be found (when his Opinion comes narrowly to be scanned) to make God either a Favourer of Sin, or an Enemy of Righteousness. The Sum of all is, That when God tells us, that *Death is the Wages of Sin*, he does not therefore pass it into a Law, because it pleases him so to do ; but because it is just in it-self, that he should do so : And that if it had not been just in it-self, he had not upon that single Account willed it at all. So that upon the whole, it does remain a fixed and settled Truth, That Death is the Wages of Sin by the eternal and immutable Laws of Justice, and that it cannot be otherwise, so long as God loves himself, and so hates whatsoever is contrary to himself and to his Nature, as all Sin most undoubtedly is. And therefore when any Man sins against God, as by so doing, he does of necessity forfeit God's Favour, so also by consequence, he does by necessity forfeit

and forfeit his own Life, which has nothing else to depend upon, but that Favour alone.

And as a Temporal Death upon Sin is necessary, because both threatned and incurred before the Promise of a Saviour ; so after the Saviour has laid down his Mediatorial Office, an Eternal Death will be found to be so too. I word it so, lest my Caution before this Head should by this time be forgot. Now, if it be not an Eternal Law of Justice, that Punishment is the necessary Reward of Sin ; then it may be all one, as to the Event, (and that justly and finally too) whether a Man depart this Life the best or the worst Man in the whole World. For, if there be not some Law of Justice, that shall at the last Day distinguish the Event of their contrary Courses, then nothing can : And if that Justice be not necessary (let the Means, by which it is not so, be what they will) the Difference between their Condition can be but *casual*, (or at the very best, but *arbitrary*) and so we must leave them both to a grand *Perhaps* ; which will be in effect to destroy all Religion and Justice.

There is one thing against this Discourse, of weight and moment ; which tho' I shall professedly answer in another Place, yet shall not go unmentioned here : And that is, That if the Punishment of Sin be absolutely just and necessary, then how came it to pass, that God did in his Counsel design, and in his Wisdom

dom appoint a Saviour, in order to the Pardon of Sin? For, in Order of Nature the Design of Pardon must be antecedent to the Design of sending a Saviour: And therefore if the Punishment of Sin be, as it is laid down, both just and necessary, God's Design of Pardon going counter to this Law, should seem to be unjust. For how could he justly design to pardon That, which in Justice and Necessity he stood obliged to punish?

Now to this several Things may be answered. As,

1. *First*, That God did never design to pardon Sin, but only in and through a Saviour. And how far such his Design, under such a Restriction and Limitation, is just is very much the Business of that part of the Discourse, which in its Place is to follow, and therefore must not be forestalled here.

2. That notwithstanding a Saviour, yet God did never pardon any sinful Creature. All the Sinners, that we know, are the fallen Angels and Men. What the Scriptures acquaint us with concerning the first, we know well enough: And among such Things, we know also, that it gives us an Account of the Punishment of their Sin. And as for Men; those of them that shall be saved at last, in consideration of their Saviour's Merits, do yet in this World suffer Losses and Crosses, and Pains, and Diseases, and Death. All which are undoubted Punishments of Sin.

And

And for the rest, who shall by a final Impenitence reject the Benefit of the Saviour's Purchase (besides the Calamities which they suffer in common with the Good in *this* World) the Scriptures do acquaint us sufficiently with their Doom in the *next*. So that if it may be an Argument, that Punishment is the necessary Reward of Sin, because all Sinners have, do, and shall suffer Punishment; then God's designing of a Saviour for Mankind, in order to their Pardon, does not take off the Force of such Argument; because, notwithstanding such his Design, and such Saviour, no Sinner whatsoever did, or ever will go unpunished.

3. But then, *thirdly*, It is a Mistake, that the Salvation of Man from Punishment was the immediate and direct Design in God's Counsel of sending a Saviour. For, as we shall see hereafter, [See *Chap. 12.*] the Business of our Saviour's Coming was to bring back Mankind to his Father's Kingdom, who had been drawn into a Revolt from his Dominion and Jurisdiction, by the Sollicitations of the Devil, and had thereby put a Slight upon the Authority of the King of all the World, and so, in some sense, lessened the Extent of his Kingdom. Now those whom our Saviour shall so bring back to their Allegiance, by restoring them to their lost Holiness, shall indeed be saved: But then their Salvation is a Consequence of their Return
to

to Holiness; and so was not properly the Design of God's sending a Saviour, but the Consequence of the Success of such Design.

C H A P. II.

The Gospel holds forth no such thing, as an Absolute or Unconditional Pardon; no, nor yet an Arbitrary Pardon.

THe next and Second Proposition offered to be made good, in order to our main Design, is this; *That the Gospel holds out no such thing to us, as an absolute Forgiveness of Sin.* Which Proposition I therefore lay down here, not only because it is introductory to some Things, which are to follow; but also to obviate the Conceit of those Men, who think they do sufficiently wipe away the Merits of our Saviour in reference to the Pardon of our Sins, by telling us, that God may without any more ado pardon such our Sins by his Free Grace.

1. But, in the first place, we cannot but take notice, that what God *may* do, and what he has declared he *will* do, are Two very different and distinct Things. Though therefore it be supposed, that God *may* grant us an absolute Pardon; yet if in those very Revelations, in which he has discovered to us his Intention of pardoning us, he does expressly tell us,

us, that he will *not* do so; it will be proper and modest in us, to acquiesce in what he so tells us, rather than to raise in our Imaginations conceited Possibilities, which do directly contradict such his Declarations.

2. But, secondly, He who brought us the Gospel-Dispensation, in order to the Pardon of our Sins, does in that Dispensation require our Repentance in order to such our Pardon. Now if Repentance be a Condition of the Pardon, then for that Reason alone the Pardon cannot be Absolute; because an Absolute Pardon is an Inconditional Pardon, and it is impossible, that the same Pardon should be a Conditional, and an Inconditional Pardon too.

3. An Absolute Pardon of Sin fights directly against all that we have said under our last Head, concerning the Necessary Justice of Punishment: And therefore, till all that be wiped away, we may upon those Grounds deny, that there is any such sort of Pardon. For, it looks a little too harsh, and that too to Natural Reason, to tell us, that God will be reconciled to the Enemy of his Nature, and that upon the account of mere Mercy and Compassion; and that, in order to his being so, he will throw away all Considerations of his Justice, which in this Case we may adventure to call his Natural Displeasure.

4. If we should suppose or allow such a thing, as an Absolute Forgiveness; then we must also allow, that it may be the same thing, whether a Man has been the *best*, or the *worst* Man in the whole World. For an Absolute Forgiveness, in the Reason and Nature of it, may as well be extended to the one, as to the other. For, let what Reason soever be assigned, why it may *not*; and that very Reason (be it what it will) will prove the Forgiveness not to be *absolute*. For, that Forgiveness cannot be so, that is limited or restrained by any Reason whatsoever.

5. An Absolute Pardon does throw a Slur upon God's Wisdom, no less than it does so upon his Justice. For, the Law being his, against which we have transgressed, and he having in that very Law threatned Vengeance upon such as shall transgress it; if after the Transgression he should grant an *absolute* Pardon to such Transgression, he would by *such* a Pardon as much *void* and *annul* the Law, as he had by his *Threatning established* and *confirmed* it: And so it might come to the same pass, as to the *final* Event, whether he had made any Law or no. For, what is the Difference, not to *make* a Law, and not to *execute* it? And therefore St. Paul, point-blank to our purpose tells us, in the Third to the *Romans*, the Fifth and Sixth Verses, That if God should not execute Vengeance, he would not only be unrighteous, but that also

he could not judge the World. And we may add, that he would not only be *unrighteous*, but (considering the Contrariety that would be between his Practice and his Law) he would be *unwise* also. And therefore,

6. Lastly, The last Judgment, and that Description that we meet with of it in *Gods Word*, do fully assure us, that he has no such Designs in his Counsels, as to throw away his Laws to gratifie his Enemies with Impunity.

From all which Reasons, and (as we do believe) from each of them in particular, it seems satisfactorily evident, that a *Gospel-Pardon* of Sin is no *absolute* Pardon: And that therefore, when God does in the Gospel promise Pardon of Sin, there must be some previous Conditions, that must be observed in order to such a Pardon. And what Share our Saviour has in the Performance and Accomplishment of such Conditions, we shall learn hereafter.

In the mean time, before we dismiss this Chapter, we must not dissemble, that it may be *surmised*, and therefore also, that it may be *objected*, That tho' there should be no *absolute* Gospel-Pardon, that yet there *may* be an *arbitrary* Gospel-Pardon; and that there are some Expressions in the New Testament, that lean that way, and may at least incline us to believe, that there is such a Thing. But because we are sure, that no Pardon can come from God, but what is just; and because we know that *Arbitrary Justice* is only one Branch

of Arbitrary Power, and therefore is in reality no Justice at all (for it is only a resolute Determination of the Will, without any Reason for such Determination) therefore we are sure, that it cannot belong to God. For all his Actions are limited and bounded by his Holiness, that is, by the Eternal Rules of Reason and Justice: And he only therefore wills what he pleases, because he neither does not can please to will any thing, but what is Just.

C H A P. III.

A Gospel-Salvation contains in it, 1. Pardon of Sin. 2. The Gift of Eternal Happiness. To these, Two other Things required: 1. An Expiation of Sin. 2. A Restitution to Holiness. Negatively, the several Ways how such Expiation cannot be made; from whence an Inference of the Doctrine asserted, with some Practical Inferences.

HAVING in the First Chapter made it good, that Misery and Death, that is, in one Word, that Vengeance is, as the just, so also the necessary Wages of Sin: And, in the Second, That the Gospel it self holds out no such thing to us as either an Absolute or Arbitrary Forgiveness of Sin: Our next Proposition must be, *That because the Gospel*
in

in this very Case is the Revelation of God's Will, and because the Will and Counsel of God in that Gospel revealed is the Pardon and Salvation of Man; that therefore Man's Sin is to be pardoned, tho' not by an absolute or arbitrary Forgiveness.

And then, because it must for that Reason be pardoned some way or other; it will be our next Business to enquire, what that Way is. For, by such Enquiry it may perhaps appear to be a Gospel-Truth, and that too agreeable to Reason, That *there is not Salvation in any other, but in Jesus Christ alone;* and, that *there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved.*

And here, because the Gospel promises no *absolute* Pardon of Sin; as we do from thence in the first place conclude, that the Pardon must be *conditional*; so we must in the next place enquire, what that Condition, or what those Conditions are, upon which this Pardon is to be obtained.

Now, if in order to our more rational and satisfactory Resolution of this Enquiry, we do first look into the Gospel, there to inform our selves, what a Gospel-Salvation means; we may from thence learn, that it does contain in it Two Things: Whereof the first is, *Pardon* of Sin; and the second is, the Gift of *Eternal Happiness*. And in order to the obtaining of these Two Things (as we shall

see more fully in the farther Prosecution of this Matter) Two other Things are in the Gospel required: 1. An *Expiation of Sin*; and, 2. A *Restitution to our lost Holiness*. For, as we may conclude from our second Proposition, That (tho' the Gospel does allow a *Pardon*, yet because it does not allow an *absolute Pardon of Sin*, that) therefore *something* will be required in *order* to such a Pardon: So we may conclude from our first Proposition, That (because *Punishment for Sin is necessary*) therefore *some Punishment* (be that what it will at present) *must* be suffered for our Sin.

And then, if in the Progress of our Discourse it shall appear, that in Consideration of any such Punishment so suffered, the Gospel-Pardon of our Sins does afterwards ensue; then such Pardon may be so far ascribed to such Punishment, as that our Guilt, and the Vengeance due to such our Guilt, may be truly esteemed to be expiated by it.

Now, in order to find out what Punishment it is, that *can* make such an Expiation, we shall first enquire, what Punishment *cannot* do it. And because Repentance does not so wholly consist in *Action*, but that it must have something of *Suffering* mixed with it; therefore in pursuit of our Design, let our first *Negative Proposition* be this:

I. That our *Repentance* for our Sins can never make out an Expiation of our Sins.
For,

For, tho' Repentance for our Sins be a *Gospel-Condition* required of us, without which we shall never be made Partakers of the Benefit of the *Gospel-Expiation* ; yet, notwithstanding that, we neither *do*, nor *can* by our Repentance make out *that* Expiation for Sin, which is by the Gospel *necessary* for our Salvation. For, besides that there is no Man's Repentance so *exact* and *compleat*, as to free him from *all* Sin, *while* he lives ; and so after all he must remain a Sinner as *long* as he lives : I say, besides that, His very *manner* of going out of the World, and that is by Death, is a demonstrative Proof, that his Repentance has *not* made an Expiation for his Sins ; because we may most certainly conclude, that his Sins are not then *expiated*, and so neither *pardoned*, when God himself lays on the Penalty threatned in his Law with his *own* Hand. For when God gave his Law to Mankind in their universal Father and Representative *Adam*, we know, that he *ratified* such Law by the Penalty of Death ; and we know also, that every Man (let him be as penitent as can be supposed) does still *suffer* that Penalty. And we may from thence also know, that for that Reason no Man's Repentance can so far expiate his Sin, as to free him from the Punishment threatned to it by the Law. And then from the whole we may conclude, That if any Man be saved because he is a true Penitent, he must be saved by some

other Expiation, than by such his Repentance; forasmuch as his Repentance can at the most but qualifie him to be made a Partaker of such Expiation.

2. As Man's *Repentance* for his Sin (which we may call his *voluntary* Punishment for Sin) cannot; so neither can his *professed Punishment* (which we may call his *legal* Punishment for Sin) expiate his Sin, and so obtain for him a Gospel-forgiveness; and that for this Reason, because there is such a Thing in the Gospel, as an *eternal* Punishment, allotted to Sin. And as under the *last* Head we found, that Reason did fall in with the Gospel, and that they both spake the same thing; so also we shall find it *here*. For, it is certain, that the Punishment of sinful Man can therefore never *expiate* his Sin, because it can never purchase a just *Release* from Punishment; and it is certain, that it cannot do *that*, if it may be justly continued to *Eternity*. And that it may be so, we may learn from hence, because the Law of *Grace* being God's Law, as well as the Law of *Works*, must for that Reason be just: And we are assured by this Law, as much as Words can assure us, that the Punishment which it denounces against those, who do not fulfil the Conditions of it, is *Eternal*. And that it shall so prove, besides the express Words of the Law, we have this farther Reason; which is, that the suffering the Punishment *threatned* by the Law to those

those, who *neglect* to perform the Conditions of the Law, can neither in Sense or Reason pass for the *Performance* of such Conditions so neglected; and that the Neglect of this Law shall (and that in Reason and Justice) be repaid with an *additional* Vengeance for the *refusal* of the *Mercy* offered in it, (which designs to free us from the Punishment of all our other Sins) as well as with *that* Punishment, which is *due* to such Sins. For, it is Reason and Justice, that a more *heinous* Sin should be punished with a more *grievous* Judgment; and it is Truth and Reason, that a Sinner does then become a more *heinous* Criminal, when to his *Desert* of Punishment, he adds a *Neglect* or *Contempt* of the easie Conditions of Pardon. And since by the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, such Sinner is to suffer his Punishment after his Resurrection from the Dead, that is, not only after the Time limited for the Possibility of his Pardon is expired, but also after Death it self shall be destroyed; as we may from thence conclude the *certainty*, so may we also the *eternal* Duration of his Punishment. For, as a Punishment due *after* the Day of Grace is *past*, will not be *remitted*; so such Punishment, when *Death* is no *more*, cannot be *determined*. By which we may understand, that as Death is, without a Saviour, the just and necessary Wages of Sin, (as we made it good in our first Chapter) so also, that when
such

such Death is sure (by a Resurrection purchased by a Saviour) to be taken away, in order to an happy and everlasting Life, (and that too upon the *easy*, or, at worst, the very *feasible* Conditions of the Gospel;) yet if Men will *neglect* such Salvation, so placed within their reach, and so leave the eternal Life (purchased for them in order to their Happiness) exposed to the Vengeance, which is the just and necessary Reward of all their *other* Sins, and of such their *Neglect*; they must impute it to their own Folly, if such *Vengeance*, in stead of *Happiness*, be the *continued* Companion of their eternal Life. For, in the Case so put, the *Restoration* from Death to Life comes from the *Mercy* of God; the making that Life *eternal*, comes from the *Mercy* of God; the Designing to make that eternal Life *happy*, comes from the *Mercy* of God; The granting Means to Men (and those no very hard ones neither) of *obtaining* that Happiness, comes from the *Mercy* of God. But foolish Man defeats the Counsel of God, by an obstinate and unrelenting Perseverance in Sin; and does in *this* Case, as he does in *most* others, turn the *Blessing* of God into a *Curse* upon *himself*; that is, he makes that Life, which was designed for his eternal *Happiness*, an Occasion of the eternity of his *Misery*.

One thing more may be added to what has been said upon this Head, and then we shall apply

apply it to our present Design; and that is, That at that time, when the Punishment we now speak of shall come to be inflicted, our Saviour (as the Scriptures tell us) will have laid down his Mediatorial Office, and so Men must stand the Award of their own Deserts; and then, if such their Deserts be *Evil*, we may be instructed from what was said in the First Chapter, that the Justice, which will overtake them, will be Justice without Mercy; and that pure and unmix'd Vengeance will be their Portion, even such Vengeance which will only *revenge* upon them the Breach of the Covenants of their God, but will never so much as pretend to *make up* such Breach.

To our present purpose then: If the Punishment of Men for their own Sins shall, without the Interposition of a Saviour, be *eternal*; and if this appear to be so by the Testimony of that very *Gospel*, (in which, however, there is a Possibility of Salvation held forth) and if *Reason* do vouch for the Truth of what the Gospel in this Case teaches; and lastly, if an *Eternity* of Punishment be absolutely inconsistent with an *Expiation* of Sin by such Punishment (for the *last* supposes the Sin to be *cancelled*, and the *first* supposes it to be *continued*): Then we may conclude, that the *Punishment* of Man for his Sin can no more expiate his Sin under *this* Head, than his *Repentance* (as we there made
it

it good) could do so under the *last*. And then, because there is no other possible Way for Mankind to expiate their Sin, but by their *Repentance*, or by their *Punishment*, we do conclude, that there is no possible Way for them to make any Expiation of it *at all*.

3. As Man cannot expiate his Sin by any Punishment of his *own*; neither by his *Repentance*, nor by his *Death*, whether *Temporal* or *Eternal*: So neither can he expiate his Sin by the Death of any *other* Creature. This I therefore add, because we may be apt to surmise, that what has been done *already*, may be done *again*. And we can hardly be ignorant, that the Lives of *other* Creatures have been offered to God, and that too by his own Appointment, for the Expiation of the Sins of *Men*. And (which is yet something more) they have not only been *offered* by *Man*, but they have been also *accepted* by *God*, as an effectual Expiation. And that they have been so, the History of the *Jewish* Religion, recorded in the Bible it self, may easily convince us.

But, notwithstanding all this; yet he who shall look nearer into the Matter, and examine it more nicely, will be satisfied, 1. That all those Sacrifices (tho' instituted by God himself) were only *Types* and *Shadows* of that great *Propitiatory* Sacrifice, that was to expiate the Sins of the whole World. And therefore, tho' they may serve to inform us, that

that such a Sacrifice *ought* to be in order to the Expiation of Sins, and (because they did prefigure such a Sacrifice) they might over and above foretell, that such a Sacrifice *should* be; yet because they themselves were but *Types and Shadows*, it is notorious, for that very Reason, that they were not the *Reality* and *Substance*; and that therefore the Expiation did not belong to them. Take what we say in the Apostle's Words, and so it may be more satisfactory, in the Tenth to the *Hebrews*, and the beginning: *For the Law having a Shadow of good Things to come, and not the very Image of the Things, can never with these Sacrifices, which they offered Tear by Tear continually, make the Comers thereunto perfect:* And after some other things to the same purpose, he concludes in the Fourth Verse, that *it is impossible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins.* And therefore, tho' it be freely granted, that a Remission of Sin did usually follow upon the offering of those Legal and Ritual Sacrifices; yet from what has been said, it must be granted also, that such Remission did not proceed from the Consideration of any real Expiation, that was made by *those* Sacrifices; but only from that Expiation, of which they were the Types, viz. from the Expiation made by the *Lamb of God, which was slain from the Foundation of the World*; that is, the Merit of whose Death does extend it self from the Fall

Fall of *Adam* to the Consummation of all Things.

2. But, secondly, The Lives of the Creatures offered to God, as an expiatory Sacrifice for Sin, can never make the Expiation designed, because all those Lives are *his* antecedent to such Offering. To attempt therefore to expiate our Sins by them, is no better than to offer to God what is his own already or (for our Sins are in the Gospel called *Debts*) it is to pay our Debts to God with his own Money; which, rightly considered is so far from bringing us out of debt, that it really *increases* our Debt, by the *folly*, if not also by the *mockery* of the Attempt. This is God's own Argument to his People the Jews in the Fiftieth Psalm: *I will take no Bullock out of thine House, nor He-goat out of thy Folds for every Beast of the Forest is mine, and I am the Cattel upon a thousand Hills*; with more to the same purpose, relating to the Insufficiency of their Legal Sacrifices for the Expiation of Sins.

3. The Lives of the Creatures offered to God for the Expiation of the Sins of Men can never make such Expiation; because they are of far less Value, and that too not only in the Nature of the Thing, but also in the Estimation of those that offer them, than the Lives of those for whom they are offered. Now it can never answer to the Rules of Justice, to pay our Creditor only an hundred

Pence

Pence, when we owe him an hundred *Pounds*. And he who shall think, that he can so discharge his Debt, may by the same Measures come in time to reckon, that he may discharge it for nothing.

I have spoken something the larger to these Things (tho' perhaps it may seem needless) partly because they have been a Part of God's own Instituted Worship; partly because they are a Part of the Religious Worship of many Nations at this Day; but chiefly, because they have a Relation to that great Sacrifice, which is the main Design of all our Discourse. And this our Design will still be farthered, if we consider in the

4. Fourth place, That as neither *Man* for himself, nor the Creatures, that are *inferior* to him, can make any Expiation for his Sins; so neither can the Creatures *above* him. Now the most exalted Creatures that Revelation has acquainted us with (and we know nothing in this Case, but what we have from Revelation) are the Angels and Archangels: And we may be therefore satisfied, that those glorious Beings can never make an Expiation for the Sin of *Man*; because it appears by the Revelations of God, that they can never make an Expiation for their *own* Sins. And therefore, as we are told in such Revelations, that *some* of them have sinned; so we are in the same told, that *those* that *have* so done, are reserved in everlasting Chains, to the Judgment

ment of the great Day. Now, our Natural Reason tells us, that no Creature can be so in love with Misery (and surely *everlasting Chains, and a fearful expectation of Judgment,* do imply Misery ; for, *the Devils believe and tremble :*) But, I say, our Natural Reason tells us, that no Creature can be so in love with Misery, as not to free it self from it, were it in its power so to do. And therefore the same Natural Reason does tell us, that the true Reason why the fallen Angels *do* not do so, is because they *cannot* do so. And if they cannot expiate their *own* Sins, we may be pretty well satisfied, that they cannot expiate Sin at *all* : And we may be the rather so satisfied, because we are as sure, that they would in the Case *employ* their best Endeavours for themselves, as we are sure, that they *love* themselves best.

Besides, we know, that in the Case of Mankind, Death is threatned, as the Penalty for the Breach of the Law : And we may be pretty well satisfied, that without Death no Expiation can be made : For, *without Blood there is no Remission.* But, on the other side, we have some Reason to believe, that *Angels* are not liable to *Death*, at least, not to *such* a Death, to which *Man* is obnoxious ; and therefore, for this Reason, as well as the former, we may pretty rationally conclude, That the Angels are in no Capacity to expiate the Sins of Mankind, and that therefore they cannot do it.

One

One thing more I would add to this Head, before I leave it ; and that is this : That, tho' the Angels are very glorious and exalted Creatures, and, by the Account we have of them in the Scriptures, are placed in a much higher Scale in the Creation than Man, and so are far above him ; yet still, because they are *Creatures*, they are *therefore* at as great a distance from *God*, as *Man* himself is : For, their Distance from him is infinite ; and there are, we know, no Degrees in Infinity. Now, because the Expiation of Sin is to be made to God, and to God alone ; and because there is an infinite Distance between God and *Angels*, as well as there is between God and *Man* : I say, for these Reasons, we can no more think the Interposition of an *Angel* effectual for making an Atonement and Expiation for Sin, than we can think the Interposition of a *Man* to be so. And if we should suppose a *sort* of Creatures a thousand, nay, ten thousand or more times as much above *Angels*, as *Angels* are above *Men* ; yet because, after such a Supposition, even *this* sort of Creatures are as much below God, as *Man* is ; and because the Expiation of Sin, if attempted by such Creatures, is to be made to *God* ; therefore we cannot think, that the Dignity of their Station can contribute any thing at all towards the making their attempted Expiation effectual. And we know, and that too by unquestionable Proof, that the Dignity of

E the

the faln Angels (and among them, one of them *Son of the Morning*, whatever that signifies; but we may be satisfied, that it signifies something excellent) but, I say, we know, that the Dignity of the faln Angels did not so far avail them, but that God provided and accepted an Expiation for faln Man; whereas he left them in the Hands of Justice, to attend the Events of their own Deserts. So that, for ought we can discover, either by Revelation or Reason, the *Dignity* of no *Creature* whatsoever does *qualifie* him to make an Expiation for those Sins which he shall commit against the *Creator*. For, in this Case, the Distance between the Party *offended*, and the Party *offending*, being infinite, there cannot possibly be any Mediation or Expiation, that can extend it self to *both* the Extremes. And therefore, we shall at last, from what has been said upon this Head, conclude, That no Creature, tho' never so much above Man, can ever make an Expiation to God for the Sins of Man.

5. Fifthly, and lastly: As no *sinful Creature* can ever by its Punishment expiate its *own* Sins, or the Sins of any *other Creature*; so no *innocent Creature* can do the *last*, that is, no *innocent Creature* can ever expiate the Sins of any *sinful Creature*. For, in such a Case, it must, in order to its *undergoing* the *Punishment justly*, first take upon it the *Sin willingly*; and so, by putting it self into the Place

Place of the Sinner, must first be supposed to be such a Sinner it self, before it can undergo the Punishment due to its Sin. But then, when any Creature is supposed to lie under the Burden of such Sin, it is at the same time supposed to be in the *same* Condition with the *Original* Sinner himself: For, when the Punishment comes to be transferr'd from the last to the first, it is therefore so transferr'd, because the Law allows the Act of the Surety, by which he has owned and accepted the Sin to be his own: And then the Law in such a Case makes no difference between the *Surety* and the *Principal*. And if the *Law* makes no difference, then, as to the Business of Punishment, we may be therefore sure, that there is *none*, because both are *Creatures*, and both are *Sinners*. If therefore (as we shewed before) the *Principal* could not by his Punishment (had he undergone it himself) have expiated his Guilt; then, for the self-same Reasons, the *Surety* will also be unable to expiate the self-same Guilt. So that the Conclusion of this Head will be, that as no *sinful* Creature is able to unload its self of its Sin by its Punishment; so no Creature (be it never so *innocent*) will be able to do it, by being punished for its Fellow-Creature. And therefore, as we do not know, that any of the Blessed Angels, who *retained* their Innocence, did ever interpose for the Redemption of those that *fell*, so we do most assuredly

know, that tho' they did interpose, the Event did not answer ; because we know, that the Condition of those that fell, does continue desperate: Nay, there do not want probable Reasons to persuade, that the fallen Angels *themselves* do not interpose for their *own* Redemption in any kind, no not so much as by *Prayer* : Which, if it be true ; as it is a good Argument of their Despair, so it is a probable Argument, that they have no Mediator, in whose Name they may put up such their Prayers, and for whose sake they may with any probability hope, that they will be accepted. And yet all this while we have no Reason to doubt, but that That noble Charity, which must needs accompany a perfect and unspotted Innocence (such as that of the Holy Angels is) would be inclined to engage it self one way or other for the Redemption of their fallen Brethren, did not their Prudence check and controul such a possible Inclination. And then, if such their Prudence do not consist in One of these Two Things, that is, that they either think or know, that such their Interposition would be either *sawcie* or *vain* ; we can hardly upon any other ground excuse their Neglect of such their Interposition.

In One Word ; The Scriptures have acquainted us, that some of the Angels have sinned, and that their Condition thereupon is become desperate: But the Scriptures have
not

not acquainted us, that they have any Mediator to intercede with God in their behalf, or to make Expiation for their Sin. And, as we may be satisfied, that were an Expiation *made*, their Sin must in Justice be *remitted*; so may we, that if any of the good Angels had taken upon himself to make such *Expiation*, he must, in order to his so doing, have taken upon himself the *Sin*; and so he must have brought himself into the very same Condition with those that fell; and that therefore he would have been just as unable as they, to free himself from such Condition. No! no! We *do*, or *may* know well enough, that Sin has Weight enough in it to crush both Men and Angels. *Experience* has acquainted us with the *first*; and *Revelation* has assured us of *both*. And then the Conclusion is easie; That *he* who in such a Case could relieve *either*, must for that Reason be *more powerful* than *both*. And when we come to make it out, that he who *did* so, *was* so, we shall then begin more plainly to perceive, that *there is not Salvation in any other*; tho' most of what we have hitherto offered, has directly tended to the same Design.

But before we proceed any farther, we shall make some few Remarks upon what has been already laid down, that may have an Induence upon our Practice.

1. And first, From what has been offered, we may take notice of the great Malignity

of Sin. For People *would* hardly *sin* so freely, if they *thought Sin* so deadly. And yet a little Reflection will tell us, that Sin has slain all Mankind from the time of *Adam* to the time of the Expiration of the last Man that died. We may think the Plague, the Sword, the Famine, great Destroyers: They are indeed the *Beesoms of Destruction*, and, where they come, make great Devastations among Mankind; but when we have taken a View of the Desolations caused by them, and by all other Miseries and Mischiefs besides, we must know, that as Sin has been the Parent of them all, so has it been also of all those Calamities and Destructions, that all of them have produced: And because it has so, therefore we take notice in the

2. Second place, That God's Justice is no such trifling Thing, as is but too generally thought. For, there is no *Sinner*, who ever escaped being a *Sufferer*. For, if all the Miseries which we suffer in this World (and those are neither few, nor light) do come from our Sins, as most certainly they do; then we may be easily satisfied, that even those Sinners, whom yet God does treat with the greatest Kindness of all others, do yet never go without the Marks of his Displeasure. And if he does *correct* his *Children* with *Rods* (and we may be sure, that he never does that, but he does it with *Justice* too) then, for the same Reason, we may believe, that he will *chastise* his

his *Enemies* with *Scorpions*. And upon this Account we should take care to *hear the Rod, and who has appointed it*; and should make such good use of the Miseries which we suffer in *this* World, as to let them put us in mind to flee from the Wrath to come. For, if we will not *hearken* to God's *Voice*, when he *chides* us, we shall at last, when he comes to *smite* us, *sink* under the *weight* of his Hand; and if we neglect his *Displeasure*, we shall fall under his *Fury* and *Indignation*.

3. If God in the greatest and highest Instance of his Mercy, with which he has acquainted us in his Gospel, has not allowed us an Absolute Pardon; but has even in that his Covenant of Grace required Conditions of us, in order to our being made Partakers of that Pardon, which is the Purchase of our Saviour; then it does highly concern us, that we take care to perform the Conditions on our Part, that so we be not excluded from the Benefits of such Purchase. For, tho' it be most certain, that we shall not be saved by our Repentance *alone*; yet it is as certain, that we shall not be saved *without* it. No! He who has purchased our Ransom, has in such his Purchase provided for *God's Honour*, as well as for *our Safety*; and, notwithstanding his Purchase, has taught us, that we shall *forfeit* the *last*, if we take *no* care of the *first*. Let us therefore look upon our selves, as we are in our selves, that is, as forlorn,

miserable Wretches: Let us acknowledge our selves such to God: Let us quit our Sins, which have made us such: And (as we have by such our Sins hitherto rebelled against him) let us for the future resolve to comply with his Will, that is, to the uttermost of our Power, to obey his Laws: Let us be heartily sorry, that we have been so foolish, as ever to have done otherwise. And when we have done all this, then let us *joyfully accept*, and *thankfully acknowledge* the Designs of his Pity towards us, and the Provisions that he has made for our Safety in a Saviour. For, this is the Way to bring that Salvation, which he has provided for Mankind, I say, to bring it home to our selves, and to make it our own. And I may add, that this is the only way for us to do so: For, as *there is not Salvation in any other, but in Jesus Christ alone*; so there is not any possible Way for us to make our selves Partakers of this Salvation, but by Repentance.

4. Lastly, Because we have seen, that the Condition of the fallen Angels is forlorn and desperate, for want of a Saviour to expiate their Sins; therefore this Consideration should enhance and magnifie our Praise to God, that whereas he has in his Severity passed by those glorious and exalted Creatures, and so has left them to the Stroke of pure and unrelenting Justice; yet he has not dealt so with us Men, weak and sinful Dust and Ashes. *Lord, what*

what is Man, that thou art thus mindful of him? or the Son of Man, that thou so regardest him? Therefore, Blessing, and Praise, and Honour, and Glory, be to him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb for evermore.

C H A P. IV.

That Person to whom alone the Expiation of Sin is by the Scriptures ascribed, is by the same Scriptures set forth to us, 1. As God; 2. As Man; 3. As God and Man united in one Person, or God Incarnate. No Man a competent Judge of all possible Unions. The Incarnation agreeable to the Sentiments of Mankind, and variously foretold, prefigured, and suggested in the Scriptures. Some Practical Inferences, somewhat enlarged.

HAVING seen in the foregoing Chapter, that an Expiation for our Sin could neither be made by *our selves*, nor by any other Creature; and that therefore *he*, who could make good such an Expiation, must be more than a mere Creature: It will be our next Business to search the Scriptures, in which (as we shall see more fully hereafter) the Expiation of Sin is set forth; and there to see, what Character they give of him, who made such Expiation: For, by that Means only, we are likely to come to any true

true Knowledge and Information in this great Affair.

1. Now in such Scriptures we find, first, that That Person to whom this Expiation is there ascribed, is called *God*, the *Son of God*, the *Word*, the *Only Begotten of the Father*. That he is there said to *be with his Father before the World began*; That he *laid the Foundations of the Earth*, and that the *Heavens are the Work of his Hand*; That he *created all Things that are in Heaven*, and that are in *Earth, visible and invisible*, whether they be *Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers*; That all Things were created *by him, and for him*; That he is *before all Things*, and that *by him all Things consist*. That to him is given *all Power in Heaven and Earth*; with much more to the same Import and Purpose; which we need not repeat at present, because if we believe so much (and we all, at least, pretend to believe it for the Word of God) we may from thence satisfy our selves, that he who has such a Character from God, must be the True and Everlasting God: For so is the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and so is he, who has all Power in Heaven and Earth: For, such a Description does imply in it Omniscience, and Omnipotence, and such other Attributes, by which we do (tho' in other Words) describe the True God, both to our selves, and to all others. But we shall pursue this no farther here.

here, because it is not our professed Business at present: For we have only mentioned it, and confirmed it with some few Texts of Scripture, without quoting the Places, in order to our full and clear Explication of that Expiation which was made by our Saviour. And when we come to do *that*, we shall *then* more plainly perceive, that the *Deity* of our Saviour, and the *Expiation* made by him, do mutually prove and establish each other.

2. The Scriptures do acquaint us, That that very Person to whom they do ascribe the Expiation of Sin, was a *true and real Man*. For they give us an Account of his *Conception, Nativity, Life, and Death*: They acquaint us with his *Conversation, and Manner of Life*; with his *Natural Actions and Passions*; and each of them *such*, which are undoubted *Arguments* of an *Humane Nature and Condition*: Such are his *Discourses, his Eating, Drinking, Sleeping, Grieving*, and the like: By which Account of his Person, we may be as well satisfied of his *Humanity* under *this* Head, as we may be of his *Deity* under the *last*. And I may add, that (if we do with Simplicity and Sincerity receive the Account of his Person and Character, that the Scriptures give us both in the *one* Case and in the *other*) that we may be as well satisfied of his *Deity* under the *last* Head, as of his *Humanity* under *this*. But neither shall I at present pursue this Thing any further, because I must

go on towards That, which is the present Design of it, and that is, the Expiation of Sin. Therefore,

3. Thirdly, The Scriptures do acquaint us that That very Person, to whom they do ascribe the Expiation of Sin, was God and Man in *Conjunction*, or, in other Words, that he was *God Incarnate*. To this purpose they tell us in one place, That the *Word was made Flesh*, and that *he dwelt amongst us*, or (as it is in the Original) he *tabernacled* among us, which was typified by the Feast of Tabernacles under the Jewish *Law*, and by God's *abode and residence* in the Tabernacle of the Sanctuary in the Jewish *Commonwealth* (as has been fully made out by Learned Men). We are told in another Place, that God was *manifested in the Flesh*; and in a third, that *in him*, that is, in *Jesus Christ*, *dwells all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily*; with several other Places of the same import, and to the same purpose and design. Now because this Proposition does comprehend the two former, (For if our Saviour be God Incarnate, there can be no doubt, but that he is God and Man) and because our true understanding of the Doctrine of the Expiation, does mightily depend upon the Doctrine of the Incarnation; and because, lastly, this Doctrine of the Incarnation is not only vigorously *opposed* by many among us, but also *slighted*, and even *ridiculed*, by not a few; therefore we must a while make

make a Stand here, and examine, whether the Incarnation (which we affirm to be revealed by the Scriptures) will not stand the Test, and admit the *Approbation* of Reason; or whether (as is pretended) it be so absurd, as to be easily *confuted* by Reason, or to be treated with *Contempt* and *Derision*.

And, in the first place, we cannot but take notice, that as Contempt and Derision is very *seldom* a Sign of Wisdom; so it is so far from being so, when it is employed about any thing which does appear to be the Revelation of God, that, in such a Case, we may certainly pronounce it to be *Folly*. For, let it (for once) be supposed, that some Men (and yet those some have been very far the greater Number of *Christians* through all Ages, since the *New Testament* was recorded for the Word of God.) But, I say, let it for once be supposed, that some Men have been mistaken in the Meaning of God's Revelations in the present Case: Yet because the *obvious* and *literal Sense* of such his Revelations does speak the same thing that *they* do; that is, because that Book, which is on all Sides agreed to be the Word of God, does in plain and express Words tell us, that *God was manifested in the Flesh*, that *the Word was made Flesh*, and the like; it must needs be insolent and foolish, to treat the literal and plain Meaning of such Propositions with Scorn and Derision: Because, in such a Case, should the Meaning *be*,
what

what at first view it *appears* to be, it will be but an ill Excuse for such a Treatment, to alledge, that Men *thought* otherwise; and perhaps it may be nothing better, but rather worse, to alledge, that they *knew* otherwise. No! where Things revealed, by what we ourselves confess to be the Word of God, plain, and categorical; but more especially where such Things have from the same Word of God a great deal of collateral Confirmation (as the Incarnation has) in such Cases if we doubt of the plain and literal Meaning, our best and most prudent way will be, to let our Doubting be attended with Modesty and Sobriety, and to let our Inquiry after another Sense be sincere and diligent: And not upon the Confidence of our own Presumption, or upon the presumed Strength of our Natural Reason, to reject That, which upon such an Inquiry may prove a Truth. For, if we *admit* nothing for Truth, that is proposed to us, as such, by Revelation, but what we can without such Revelation, *discover* to be so by our Natural Reason; all Revelation may, to us, be superseded: and so the *Old Testament*, indited by the Spirit of God for the Institution of the *Jewish* Religion; and the *New Testament*, indited by the same Spirit for the Institution of the *Christian*, might have very well been spared, and *Natural* Religion, which was in the World before either, might well enough have supplied the Place of Both.

Now this Consideration we have therefore offered in the first place, to check the Confidence of those, who lean so much to their own Understandings, that they will never allow Revelation to guide their Reason; but, on the contrary, do so manage it by their uncouth Expositions, as to permit it to speak no Truth, but what their Natural Reason might have acquainted them with, without it.

But to proceed: To such Men, who therefore *reject* the *Belief*, because they *deny* the *Possibility* of the Incarnation, I would put this short Question, which is, Whether or no they are acquainted with the Nature of all possible Unions? For, it is most certain, that the Reach of no Man's Understanding is so large, as to enable him where to *fix* the utmost *Bounds* of all such Unions, nor yet to account for the *Manner* how several of those Unions, with which yet it is acquainted, are made. And Instances might be given (and those too not a few) to make out what we have said. But tho' Humane Understanding is not *acquainted* with *all possible* Unions; nor can *account* for *many*, with which yet it is acquainted; yet that will be no good Argument, that therefore there are no such Unions. Alas! our most refined and improved Reason falls short in its Knowledge of the greatest part of those Things, which yet are as surely known, as it is sure, that there is such a Thing as Omniscience, and such a Being

Being as a God. And when we are once satisfied, that any Union, be it what it will, is revealed to us by Omniscience; as we may by the same Means be satisfied in Reason, that there *really is* such an Union; so we may be satisfied in Modesty, that the *Knowledge and Discovery* of such Union did *exceed* the Grasp of our Natural Understanding. Tho' therefore, in what follows, I do neither pretend to prove or to explain the Incarnation by Reason; yet if any Thing shall be offered, by which the Expressions which the *New Testament* gives us of it, shall appear to be *plain* and *literal*, and that their Meaning *is*, what it *seems* to be; it will be a sufficient Ground for our Belief of the Thing; because those with whom we have to do in the present Argument, do not pretend to doubt the *Truth*, but only the *Meaning* of such Expressions.

1. In order then to the helping forward our Faith in the Union of God and Man in the Incarnation of our Saviour; I would offer it to Consideration, That the Scriptures do instruct us, that there is a very intimate Union between Christ and his Church. And tho' Humane and *unassisted* Reason, taking its Measures from other Instances of the like Appearances, may be apt to conclude, that the Union of our Saviour with his Church is but a Political Union, such as is between a King and his Subjects, or the Head and Members

bers of an ordinary Corporation ; yet a *Christian's* Reason, once truly enlightned, and so guided by Divine Revelation, will thereupon conclude it to be something nobler and better : And because it is informed, that he took part of the same Flesh and Blood with his Members, and because he their Head does influence such his Members by his Spirit, in order to their Spiritual Life ; that therefore there is between them, in some sense, a *vital* Union.

From whence we may, to our present purpose, conclude, That one Person may be vitally united to another, and that too at the greatest apparent Distances ; and that they may by that means become one, tho' our Senses, and our Natural, but unassisted Reason, do give us in quite contrary Informations. When the King of *Syria* sent a great Host, and enclosed *Elisba* in *Dothan*, in order to his Destruction, the Man of God, to encourage his desponding Servant, desired of the Lord to open his Eyes : and when that was done, he saw the Mountain full of Horses, and Chariots of Fire round about his Master. Now tho' one might well think (and Natural Reason would be apt to incline one more than barely to think so) that Fire is a Thing very discoverable to our Sight ; (for perhaps nothing discovers it self to our Sight but Fire) yet we see, that sometimes Revelation is required even for such a Discovery.

F

But

But then, such a Revelation, when once made, does easily work a Conviction. And truly I cannot persuade my self, but that the Revelation of our Saviour's Union with his Church would do so too, would Christians but consider it with an honest and sincere Mind, and with a free and impartial Reason. For, tho' I am satisfied, that *bare* Reason could not have *discovered* it; yet I cannot so well satisfy my self, that a *diligent Use* of our Reason will then let us *dissent* from it, when once Revelation has *acquainted* us with it.

2. But, secondly, I would have it considered, in order to the Assisting our Belief of the Union of God with Man in the Incarnation of our Saviour, whether or no the *Apprehension* of the possible Union of God with Man be not (at least in some degree) *natural*. For, that the Heathen in many Countries, and in several Ages, had such a Notion, (and that too very ordinary and common) might be made out from innumerable Instances out of their several Histories. But it will be the less needful to produce any from thence, because we are furnished with one out of the *Acts of the Apostles*: For there, in the Fourteenth Chapter, where we have an Account, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* cured the impotent Man who had been a Creeple from his Mother's Womb, we are likewise told, that the *People lift up their Voices, and said, that the*
Gods

Gods are come down to us in the likeness of Men. And that we may not think, that such Apprehensions proceeded only from an Idolatrous Notion of the Deity, we may furnish our selves with Instances in abundance from the *Old Testament*, that the Worlhippers of the true God had constantly the same Apprehensions: For, tho' God sometimes appeared to the *Jews* in Fire, as to *Moses* in the Bush; and sometimes in a Cloud, as in the Tabernacle; and sometimes in both together, as in the Wilderness, and in Mount *Sinai*: Yet his more constant and repeated Appearances to particular Persons, were in the Likeness of Man. So he appeared to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, to *Jacob*, to *Joshua*, to *Manoah*, and to several others. And tho' it be freely confessed, that some of those Appearances were in reality but the Appearances of *Angels*; yet it must be granted also, that such Angels were so united to those Bodies, in which they appeared, that they did in them exercise several Actions both of an Humane and Animal Life. By which we may be instructed, that an *Angel* may be so united to *Man*, that our Knowledge of that may help to lead us one Step farther towards our Belief, that *Man* may be united to *God*. It must be granted also, that tho' in several of the Instances laid down, the *Union* was only between a *Man* and an *Angel*; yet (which is close to our present purpose) *they* who saw the Appearance, did

almost constantly *take* it for the Appearance of God. So it seems to be in the Case of *Joshua*, in the Fifth Chapter of that Book : So it was in the Case of *Manoah* and his Wife, in the Thirteenth Chapter of *Judges*, where the Man tells his Wife, *We shall certainly die, because we have seen God* : And so undoubtedly it was in the Case of *Abraham*, when he entertained the Three Men, in the Eighteenth Chapter of *Genesis* ; for *Abraham* in his Behaviour and Discourse treats one of them as the Lord God himself ; and more particularly, in the Twenty fifth Verse, calls him, *the Judge of all the Earth*.

To our purpose then ; If it be certain, that Angels have appeared to Men in Humane Shape ; If it be certain, that under such Appearances they have done several Actions of the Humane Life, such as Talking, Walking, Eating, Drinking, and the like ; If it be probable, that God himself has so appeared, and under such Appearances has also done the same Things ; And, lastly, if it be certain, that most of those People, to whom such Appearances have been made, have constantly taken such Appearances for the Appearances of God in the Likeness of Man : I say, if these Things be so, as it is probable, by what has been said in short, that so they are ; then, as we may rationally look upon such Things as Prefigurations of the Incarnation ; so may we also be so far from *thinking* the In-

Incarnation an *Absurdity*, or an *Impossibility*, that we may be satisfied, that *great, good, and wise Men* have *believed and thought otherwise*, and that too upon such their *own Experience*; to which they, who deny an Incarnation, neither *do* nor *must* pretend, unless they will by such their Pretences contradict themselves. Now, if *Abraham*, who had such an intimate Converse with God, and so was a much better Judge in the Case, than we can pretend to be, did not only acknowledge the *Possibility*, but the *Reality* of an Incarnation too, it may so much the less become us to deny it; and that too the rather, because we may easily satisfy our selves, that *he* did so believe. And therefore I do not question, but that there is more in that Saying of our Saviour, than is usually taken to be, [*Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad.*]

3. I would take notice, in the third Place, That where the Scriptures do professedly give us the Account of Man's Creation, they do frequently inculcate it upon us, that God made Man after his own Image and Likeness; I say, frequently, because I find it so delivered Six times in the Beginning of *Genesis*, and in Two Places, that is, both in the Twenty sixth and Twenty seventh Verses of the First Chapter, with an *Ingemination*; And an *Ingemination* does by the very way of Expression summon us to a more deliberate atten-

tion to, and observation of what is spoken. Now tho' we do not, with the *Anthropomorphites*, from such repeated Expressions conclude, that God has the Shape and Figure, or the Image and Likeness of a Man; yet for all that, it will be impossible to conceive any Sense in the Words, if *God* may not be so *like* to Man, as *Man* is like to *God*: For the Likeness with reference to both must be the same (be that Likeness at present what it will) or else there can be no Likeness at all. And to say, that the Likeness consists in Holiness, is too frigid an Interpretation of such an inculcated and reiterated Expression, and does not very well agree with several Texts, where such Likeness is mentioned; nor indeed does it seem to come up to the Import of the Expression. And I am therefore persuaded, that the Patriarchs apprehended, that there was something more in it, for the Reasons offered under the last Head. For, tho' *Moses*, who wrote the History of the Creation, lived after them; yet it is not only possible, but also highly probable, that their Notion of the Thing might be derived down by Tradition from *them* to *him*: And we may be the rather satisfied, that so it was, because after the Flood, God does give it as a Reason to *Noah*, why that Man's Blood shall be shed by Man, who sheds Mans Blood, because *God made Man in his own Image*. Now, (considering the Longevity of Men in those Days) as a Tradition

Tradition from *Adam* to *Noah*, so a Tradition from *Noah* to *Moses*, is a very conceivable Thing, especially in such a Case, in which several of the intermediate Descendants might reasonably conceive, that they had had, at least, something like Experience in the Case, by conversing with God in the Likeness of Man.

To come up a little closer to that Point, at which we all this while do aim : As the Derivation of all Mankind from one sole Head and Fountain, which was the *first Adam*, was a Type, that all the Elect should by Regeneration derive from one sole Fountain, which was the *second Adam* ; and as the Promise, that *the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpent's Head*, contained in it a Prophectic Account of the Manner of the Saviour's Nativity : So the Expression of *Man's being made after God's Image and Likeness*, does to me seem to be a Proleptick Declaration of the Incarnation, and, when compared with several Places in the *New Testament*, may very fairly, at this time of day, be thought to be no very dark Prophecy, that God should be made in the Likeness of Man. For, if it were in the Counsel and Foreknowledge of God, that God should become Man, and be really united to an Humane Body ; then the Expression, that *Man was made in the Image and Likeness of God*, will, upon that account, not only be warrantable, but proper. For,

when God made *Adam*, he made him (if I may so speak) by the Samplar in his own Mind: And I may the rather be allowed so to speak, because in the very Making of him God does seem to set himself a Pattern, when he says, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.* And therefore before *Man* was made at all, and before our Saviour was made *Man*, the Expression of Making *Man* after our Likeness, and in our Image, may be thought only to give an honorary Precedence to our Saviour's Incarnation, though the Creation of *Man* was to have a temporary Precedence to the same Incarnation. And then the Import of the Expression, [*Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness*] will amount to thus much; Let us make *Man* in that Image, and according to that Likeness, in which we our self in the Fulness of Time will converse among Men. And therefore, as *Man* in his Creation is said to be made in the Likeness of God; so God in his Incarnation is said to be made in the Likeness of *Man*: So we read of God's sending his Son in the Likeness of sinful *Flesh*, in the Third Verse of the Eighth Chapter to the *Romans*; and so again, in the Second to the *Philippians*, the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Verses, the Apostle tells us, that *Christ Jesus being in the Form of God, thought it no Robbery to be Equal with God, and was made in the Likeness of Man*; that is, in the same Apostle's Words, 1 *Tim.* 3. and the last

last Verse, *God was manifested in the Flesh*. And he who shall consider what Interpretation the Apostle, in the Second to the *Hebrews* and the Sixth Verse, puts upon the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Verses of the Eighth *Psalms*, and what Relation those Verses have to the Twenty sixth and Twenty eighth Verses of the First Chapter of *Genesis*, may be easily satisfied, that the Creation of *Adam* did prefigure our Saviour's Incarnation. And therefore it is remarkable to our purpose, what we meet with in the Twenty seventh Verse of the First Chapter of *Genesis*, that it is there twice said, that God created *Man* in his own *Image*; but when the Text goes on to speak both of the *Man* and the *Woman*, it is barely said, that God created them. Agreeable to which, we may add what *St. Paul* says, in the First to the *Corinthians*, the Eleventh Chapter and Seventh Verse, where he tells us, That *the Man* is both the *Image and Glory of God*; but then speaking of the *Woman*, he only says, that *she is the Glory of the Man*.

Now from the whole we argue, That *God*, in whose *Image and Likeness Man* was created, was made in the *Likeness* and Fashion of such created *Man*; that is, that *God*, who at first created *Man*, was afterwards made in the same *Likeness* himself; which, in other Words, is the same as, He became *Man* himself. Now there neither is, nor can be any doubt,

doubt, but that That God, who became Man, was the Word of God also. Now then, if *God* made *Man*, and if the *Word* of God made *Man*; and if *God* was made Man, and if the *Word* was made Flesh, that is, *Man*: Then we must first controul, not only the Account of the *Creation* given in the Scriptures, but the Account of the *Incarnation* too; that is, we must in effect contradict the *Old Testament* and the *New*, before we can deny the Union of God with Man, that is, before we can deny the *Incarnation*.

We might to all this add those several Passages in the *Old Testament* which ascribe to God the Parts of an Humane Body, such as Eyes, Ears, Nostrils, &c. or Humane Postures, Actions, Passions, and the like: Which (tho' they are usually taken to be nothing more but condescending Expressions, suited to our feeble Capacities) yet, from what has been said, may be conceived to carry in them a farther, and more mysterious Meaning, that is, to have a Regard to the *Incarnation*: And that too so much the rather, because (as Learned Men have observed) it is probable, that since the Fall God has had no other Interchange with Mankind, but by the Interposition of the Mediator. And then, if such Expressions are to be applied to the Mediator, (tho' they do not expressly foretell indeed) yet they may be thought to insinuate a future *Incarnation*.

To sum up all then in a few Words : As it is a Presumption to measure all *Possibilities* by the Standard of our own Reason ; so is it, to measure all possible *Unions* by the same Line : For there are actually several real Unions, which must be confessed to be so, which yet we should never have known, if we had not been made acquainted with them by Revelation. And where Divine Revelation (and that too acknowledged by us for such) does in as plain Words as can possibly be made use of, discover to us the Personal Union of God and Man ; and when it does moreover, by several Gradations, gently lead us (if our Willfulness or Conceitedness do not make us hang back) I say, when the Revelations of God do gently lead us into such a Belief, how dare our short-sighted Reason *contradict* the *Truth* of the *Discovery*, or *limit* the *Efficacy* of *Omnipotence* ? Do not we know, that *in him we live, and move, and have our being* ? and that if he were not present with us, we could neither think, nor reason, nor perform any the ordinary Actions or Offices of Life ? And do we think his Power so restrained, that he cannot, when the Purposes of his infinite Mercy and Goodness invite him to it, I say, do we think, that he cannot more intimately unite himself to any of us, than he has done in the more familiar and ordinary Ways ? We believe, that he will do so in another World ; and it must be something very far
out

out of our reach, which *neither Eye hath seen, nor Ear heard, nor can enter into the Heart of Man to conceive.* And yet we need not at all question, but that God can make a more intimate Union between himself and Man, than what will be requir'd to our design'd Happiness: And therefore, when he tells us, that he *has* done so, it would be very proper for us to resign our shallow Reason, and to take his Word.

One Remark I would leave here, before I leave off this Head; and that is, That tho' in the Instances produced it has appeared, that *Angels often*, and that (at least probably) *God sometimes* has appeared to Men in Humane Bodies; and that they have in such Bodies exercised several Functions of an Humane Life and Nature; and that therefore they were so united to such Bodies, that, to the Apprehensions of the Beholders, they were judged to be an Union of God and Man; yet we do not all this while either assert, or pretend to maintain, that those Unions were such, or so intimate, as that which was exhibited to us in the Incarnation of our Saviour. For, we have not offered the several Instances of Divine Appearances to *explain* the *Manner* how the Union is made, but only to *facilitate* the *Credibility* of it. For, if we are once *satisfied* of the *last*, it is no great matter, tho' we are *ignorant* of the *first*. For, a *reasonable* Belief of the *Possibility* of the Thing,

Thing, will wipe away all Arguments that shall pretend to maintain its *Absurdity*; and the *Possibility* of it, when backed with several exprefs and literal Revelations of its Certainty, will be abundantly fufficient to make our *Belief* of it *certain*. Those who pretend to go farther, and are not contented till they offer to others a nice Explication, how this, and other such like Myfteries are brought to pafs, do only place themselves in the Dark, and ever after that stumble and founder at every Step they take. It is better in such Cafes to be modest and wife; and truly we shall therefore *approve* our selves *wise*, if we *keep* our selves *modest*. Alas! we know not how any one Effect in Nature is produced, tho' such Things lie exposed to our narrowest Search and Disquisition. And if we are Strangers to the Methods of God's Working in these ordinary and obvious Things, with which we daily converse, why should we pretend to trace him in his deeper and more mysterious Counfels; in such Things, which he has cover'd with a thicker Veil; Things, that are hid from Principalities and Powers, and such as the Angels themselves desire to look into? In such Cafes then it is well enough with us, if we have fufficient *Ground* for our *Faith*, tho' we can discover *nothing* to *gratifie* our *Curiosity*. And our Faith in such Truths must then be stronger, and more firm, when we have not only the exprefs and plain Word
of

of God, that so Things *are*; but when we have also the concurrent Satisfaction of our own Reason, that so they *may* be. And if any thing that has been said, may but only so far help our Faith in the Article of the Incarnation, then I hope that we shall no longer question it, much less contradict and gainsay it, and least of all despise and ridicule it.

But tho' I would willingly hope, that what has already been offered may help to persuade the Possibility, and therefore also the Credibility of the Incarnation; yet I do not at all question, but that a great many other Things will fall in to confirm and ratifie such a Possibility. For, when we shall come to make out the Expiation made by our Saviour, we shall then perceive such an Harmony and Congruity between that Expiation and the Incarnation, that we shall be satisfied, that all those Revelations, which *mention* the one, do at the same time *confirm* the other; and that the Truth of *each* is therefore the more certain and firm, because the Support is *mutual*. Which they seem to be aware of, who endeavour to invalidate the Doctrine of the *Incarnation*; because for that purpose they never boggle in their Attempts to evacuate and make null the Doctrine of a *Gospel-Redemption*; and break through a multitude of *express* Texts, not to say the *Tenor* of the *whole Gospel*, to make good such their Attempt. But we must leave the farther Prosecution of these Things

Things to another Place, because when they are laid together, their Evidence and Reasonableness will appear more plain and satisfactory.

In the mean time, I would offer some Practical Considerations from what has been already laid down; that so the Doctrine delivered may as well *promote* our *Piety*, as *increase* our *Faith*.

Now the Doctrine of our Saviour's Incarnation in order to our Redemption, does contain in it

1. First, Matter of *Praise* and *Thanksgiving*; and,
2. Directions how to *pay* such Praise and Thanksgiving, as we *ought*.

In our Prosecution of the First of which Things, I would desire all Christians seriously to consider, that they ought the more heartily and devoutly to praise God our Saviour, that he was pleased to take upon him our Flesh, in order to our Redemption, because our Condition, by reason of our Sins, was so desperate and forlorn, that neither our own Repentance, nor our own Punishment, no nor the Punishment or Interposition of the Angels, could ever have redeemed us from that Curse, which we, by such our Sins, had brought upon our selves. For, as for our selves, it is most certain, that we are less able to *return* to our Innocence, after we have *sinned*, than we were to *retain* our Innocence before

before we had *lost* it. For, every Sin (as our sad Experience may easily inform us) weakens our Ability to resist Sin; and it is far more easie to *preserve* our Innocence, than to *restore* it: And then, when our *Ability* is made *weaker*, and our *Business* is become *greater*, we may easily judge, that such our Business is very likely to go undone. For which Reason, as well as for several others, formerly mentioned, we may be sure, that when we had once brought our selves into a sinful, and, for that Reason, into a miserable Condition; we had, by the same Means, put it out of our Power to redeem our selves from such Sin, and from such Misery. And it is as certain, that no Man ever was or will be able so to do, as it is certain, that all Men are Mortal: For, *Death is the Wages of Sin*. And as the Experiment has passed the Test, that *Mankind* cannot save it self from its Sin; so it has as good as done so, that neither can the *Angels* save it: For if they could, then they would in Nature first have done such a Kindness for themselves. But the Condition of the fallen Angels discovered to us by *Revelation*, assures us, that there is no Possibility for them to do such a Kindness for *themselves*; and then *Reason* will tell us, that neither can they do it for *Man*. Herein then was the Love of our Saviour manifested, and mightily enhanced, that he was pleased to step in for our Rescue, when we can discover

no other Way for our Escape. . And, if there be not Salvation in any other, then we may be sure, that our greatest Praise and Acknowledgments are due to him, who alone *could* bring us Salvation, and who alone *has* brought it; and so has not refused us that Mercy, which he alone was qualified to bestow.

2. We ought to magnifie and praise our Saviour, not only because he was pleased to *undertake* our Redemption, when he alone could make good such an Undertaking; but that also, to make such his Undertaking good; he was pleased to take upon him our *Nature*, and to come down to us in that Nature. The Condescension of the Mercy ought to magnifie his Praise in our Mouths, and in our Hearts too; and with Astonishment, and an humble Adoration, we may well cry out with the *Psalmist*, *Lord, what is Man, that thou art thus mindful of him? or the Son of Man, that thou so regardest him?* We know well enough, that God does every day stoop to the Relief of our Necessities: His Eye goes through the World, and all Things are under his Inspection and Care; and he, who feedeth the young Ravens, that call upon him, and cloaths the very Grass of the Field with Ornament and Beauty, does also provide for the Support and Welfare of him, who is made after his own Image. But then this is the Care of his *ordinary* Providence; And be-

cause the Providence is ordinary, therefore also it is too generally neglected by us, and the Familiarity of it does bring it into Contempt. But when he engages himself to free us from a greater Mischief than Famine or Nakedness, that is, from our Sins, then, the *Mercy* is greater, so also is the *Method*, by which he brings it to us, more *wonderful* and *astonishing*. For, in this last Case, he does not only stoop to our *Wants*, but to our *Condition* also : And he, who would not execute his *Judgments* upon *Sodom*, till he came down to see, whether the Cry of their Sins were so or no, would neither bestow his greatest *Blessing* without a personal Visit. He brought the Salvation, which he designed to bestow, and then appeared in the greatest *Humility*, when he was about to display the Glory of his *most* endearing *Attribute*. For, his *Condescension*, then to take upon him the Form of a *Servant*, when he designed to become a *Saviour* ; nay, *therefore* to do the *First*, *because* he designed to be the *Last*, was *Mercy* mixed with *Sweetness* ; and when he put on our *Condition*, in order to the conveying such his *Mercy* to us, we stand bound in *Gratitude* to acknowledge the *Condescension*, as well as the *Mercy*. We receive the Favours of *great* Personages (especially if they do them to us in *Person*, and not by *Proxie*) with *Deference* and *Respect* : And tho' it may perhaps be but a *Smile*, or a *gracious Nod* ; yet

yet because even such little Things bring along with them the Tokens of a condescending Kindness, they are therefore entertained with a *joyful Welcome*, as well as with an *humble Acknowledgment*. If therefore we would but behave our selves in proportion to our condescending God, as we do to our condescending *Fellow-Creatures*, we ought in reason to receive his Visit to us, that brings Salvation with it, not only with humble *Acknowledgments*, but with humble *Adorations* too. And when we find, that he does not disdain to take care in his own Person (if I may so speak) of our Happiness and Salvation, we should be officiously ambitious of setting forth his Honour and Praise, for such his *Condescension*, and for such his *Care*.

3. We ought to praise our God, not only that he condescended to be united to our *Nature*, and so to take upon him our *Condition*, in order to our *Redemption*; but his Praise ought still to be so much the *more* magnified, that he stooped to *Sinners*, as well as *Creatures*; and that the grand Design of his Condescension, was the Saving of his *Enemies*. We stand at an infinite *Distance* from him, as we are his *Creatures*; but we stand in an infinite *Opposition* to him, as we are *Sinners*. In the *First* Case we are *capable* of his *Bounty*; but in the *Last*, we *forfeit* his *Mercy*; and had he obliged us to stand the Award of our own Deserts, Vengeance had been, as

our *miserable*, so our *just* Portion. Now our Natural Sense tells us, that a Favour to an *Enemy* is at least a *double* Favour: It requites Good for Evil, and does a Man a *Benefit*, even against his own *Endeavours*. Now he, who has so much Bowels of Mercy, as to relieve his Enemy; as he *has* a very noble *Temper*, so he *deserves* a very noble *Character*. But still this Character must run higher, if he shall rescue his Enemy from *that Mischief* which he had pulled upon *himself* by his *Enmity* towards his *Deliverer*. And this is the Case of *sinful Man* with Relation to his *Saviour*: For our Sins had not only *deserved*, but had also *provoked* the Plagues of Justice; they were Acts of *Hostility* against God, and carried in them *Malice*, as well as *Ingratitude*. And in such a Case, Reason and Justice will teach us to expect, that *abused Omnipotence* should vindicate it self with *Severity* of *Vengeance*. But the Condescension and Mercy of our Saviour has taught us otherwise, and may easily convince us, that the Hostilities of impotent Creatures do not always extinguish the Love of him that made them; that he pities the Peevishness, and even Wilfulness of his Children; and that he so considers their Weaknesses and Imperfections, that, in commiseration to their feeble Condition, he lets his Pity take place of his Severity, and is so far from dealing with them according to their Deserts, that he interposes for their Rescue;

for

for their Rescue from the *Folly*, and from the *Vengeance* of Sin; and even stoops to the *Lowness* of their Condition as *Creatures*, that he may save them from the *Misery* of their Condition as *Sinners*. And because in doing so, he does many ways make the Wonder of his Love and Condescension appear still greater and greater; therefore it will be our Duty more and more to magnifie him for such his *Condescension*, and for such his *Love*.

4. We ought to praise God our Saviour, as that for our Redemption he was pleased to condescend to our Condition, by being clothed with our Flesh; so also, in that by being so clothed, he *passed* the *fallen Angels*, and took not *their* Nature upon him. It is a Remark made by the Author to the *Hebrews*, that *he took not on him the Nature of Angels, but he took on him the Seed of Abraham*. I know well enough, that it is objected, That the Original imports, that he took not *hold* of the Angels, but he took *hold* of the Seed of *Abraham*; and it is confessed, that the Greek will admit and approve such an Interpretation; and (which is more) the Interpretation is close and proper so far as concerns the *Language*; but then it is not full, so far as concerns the *Context*: For when we are told *before*, that *he took part of the Flesh and Blood whereof his Children were made*; and when we are told immediately *after* the Words, that *in all things it behoved him to be*
G 3 made

made like unto his Brethren, that he might be a merciful High-Priest; we may easily allow, that he took on him the Nature of such his Children, and of such his Brethren. But that by the by, to assert and make good the Propriety and Validity of our *English* Translation, against the Adversaries of the Incarnation. But more directly to our purpose: Since the Son of God, the Saviour of Mankind, was pleased to interpose for the Redemption of fallen *Man*, but did not do so for the Redemption of fallen *Angels*; it must be confessed, that the *lost* and forlorn Condition of the *one*, when compared to the *restored* Condition of the *other*, must needs afford a weighty Argument of Praise and Thanksgiving to *Man*, when he finds his *own* Safety and Welfare preferred by the Saviour, to that of *Angels*, and has not only a *Possibility*, but also the comfortable *Hopes* and (if it be not his own Fault) an *Assurance* of that Salvation, of which they must for ever despair. Now, Natural Reason might perhaps incline us to think, that the Rescue of the fallen *Angels* by a Saviour might therefore have been a more honourable *Purchase*, because the *Angels* are a more noble *Creature*; and the *Dignity* of such a *Creature* might seem to countenance the *preference* of such a *Purchase*. But in these Things our Reason is short-sighted, and we may easily judge *amiss*, because we judge in the *Dark*. Thus much, however,

however, to our present purpose, we are sure of, and that is, that it is a *greater* Condescension to stoop to the Relief of an *inferiour* Creature; and that where there is *such* a *Condescension*, there that Creature is obliged to the *greater* *Gratitude*. And *this* is confessedly our *Case*; and therefore such *Gratitude* is undoubtedly our *Duty*. Let us therefore with Heart and Voice rejoice in this miraculous Salvation of our God; the Salvation which old *Simeon* saw, and *embraced* before his Death; the Salvation, which *St. John*, the Beloved Disciple, tells us, *was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have looked upon, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life*: That is, in a few Words; The Word of Life, the Son of God, the Saviour of the World, by his Incarnation made manifest to our Senses, and by the same Incarnation qualified to be our Sacrifice, our High-Priest, our Redeemer. *To him therefore be Glory and Praise in all Churches of the Saints. Amen.*

But that we may learn to praise him aright, both for the Greatness and Condescension of his Mercy too; let us take these few, and following Rules, to guide us in our Practice of such Praises. For a verbal Thanksgiving is too poor an Offering for so superlative a Blessing; and to praise God, who searches the Heart, with our Lips, when we do not do it with our Hearts, is in deed and truth to

mock him. That we may not therefore *increase* our *Sins*, when we pretend to *perform* our *Duty*, we may do well to guide our Gratitude in the Case by these following Directions. And,

1. Did our God condescend to take upon him our *Flesh*, that he might by his *Instructions*, by his *Example*, by his *Life*, and by his *Death*, purchase to himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works, and so from a sinful and degenerate Condition, exalt us to a State of Holiness, and by consequence of Happiness? Then we ought to meet our God in such his gracious Design; and by lifting our Hearts towards Heaven, and so by setting them upon Heavenly Things, to endeavour to be *holy*, as he is *holy*. It is a noble Ambition, and complies with the Counsel and Design of his Incarnation: For it will engage our Souls in higher Flights of Duty, and render us fit Inhabitants of that Place, where Holiness is both the greatest Happiness, and the greatest Ornament. For, tho' some of God's Attributes are so peculiar to himself, that they are utterly incommunicable to any of his Creatures; such are his *Omnipotence*, his *Omniscience*, and the like; yet there are others, which he has not only *proposed* to our Imitation, but which also he has *commanded* us to imitate; and such are his *Love*, his *Mercy*, his *Justice*, in one Word, his *Holiness*. And therefore he does require us to be
holy,

holy, because *he* is holy. And it would be
 no hard matter to make it out, that his *Holi-
 ness* is his *prime* and *leading* Attribute, such as
 guides and conducts all the rest : And there-
 fore tho' he be Omnipotent, yet for all that,
 he cannot do any thing that is unjust, be-
 cause he is holy. Does God then *allow*, nay
 require us to *imitate* him in his prime and
 leading Attribute, and by *stooping* to our Na-
 ture, provoke us to *exalt* that Nature so far,
 as to make our selves like to him in those
 Things, for which his Praise is chiefly cele-
 brated? Then let us for once gratifie our
 Ambition the right way ; and tho' we are but
Men, yet let us in this attempt to make our
 selves like to *God*, as he in his Incarnation
 was pleased to make *himself* like to *us*. The
 Attempt is great and generous, and worthy
 the Endeavours of our best Endowments, and
 most noble Faculties : For, if we chearfully
 cast off our Sins, and, by a constant and sin-
 cere Practice of Holiness, do make it our Bu-
 siness to be like our Saviour, holy and unde-
 filed, as he our High-Priest was, we shall in
 some sense lift our selves above the Earth,
 even while we inhabit in it ; and tho' we can-
 not *get up* to Heaven, yet we shall, by that
 means, bring Heaven *down* into our Souls,
 and so shall in some measure anticipate our
 consummate Happiness. And since the grand
 Design of our Saviour's Humiliation in his
 Incarnation, was to engage us to this holy
 Ambition ;

Ambition ; let us have a care, that we do not defeat such his Design, and our own greatest Hopes.

2. Did our Saviour, by taking our Flesh and Blood, and so uniting it to himself, consecrate our Nature to the great and noble Purposes of Holiness and Mercy ? And did he also, by so doing, so intimately unite us to himself, that we are Flesh of his Flesh, Bone of his Bone, and Members of his Body ? Then this should teach us, to have a more sacred and especial Care, by no means to pollute That, which he has so consecrated. And therefore what St. Paul says in the Case of Fornication, [*Shall I take the Members of Christ, and make them the Members of an Harlot ? God forbid,*] that we may say in all other like Cases ; Shall we take the Members of *Christ*, and make them the Members of a Drunkard, of an unclean, of an intemperate Person, or indeed of any other Sinner whatsoever ? God forbid. For, we should be ashamed to abuse our Bodies, which by his Incarnation are so nearly allied to his Body, that they are the same Flesh and Blood with it : I say, we should be ashamed to abuse them by such Practices, which we must needs know, his Soul abhors : And this our Shame should therefore be attended with the greater Confusion, because whereas he took upon him our Flesh, that in that Flesh he might *work out our Salvation* ; we, when we employ it in any Sin,

Sin, do indeed employ it to its own utter Ruine and Damnation. Let us therefore have a care, that we be sober, chaste, temperate; because otherwise we bring a Scandal upon our greatest Friend and Benefactor: For, by abusing our *own* Bodies, when we our selves are Members of *his* Body, we do by the Slander of such our Doings abuse *his* Body also.

And here I take my self to be obliged to leave a Mark upon one Practice too too general among Christians; and that is, That when they do professedly pretend to commemorate the Infinite Mercy of their Saviour's Incarnation, they are so far from doing it in a way agreeable to his Honour, that, instead of that, they do too commonly do it by Excesses, Surfeitings, and Drunkenness: And so when they pretend to offer to God, for their Saviour's Incarnation, the *Praises* of Men, by their Manner of doing it, do render themselves more *vile* than *Beasts*. Which Practice, as it is in it self profligately *vile* and *wicked*; so it has brought such a *Scandal* upon the Duty by such its Wickedness, that not a few (and those too devout and zealous *Christians*, tho' their Zeal and Devotion does indeed want Wisdom) have leaped over into the other Extreme, and have utterly disallowed any Commemoration of the Infinite Blessing at all. So easily do foolish Men run into Extremes on both Sides, and leave the Golden Mean to be practised only by a few, that is, by the truly Wise.

3. Did our Saviour humble himself to our Nature and Condition, in order to the working out of our Salvation? Then this should teach us to be like him in this very respect, and not to disdain to stoop to our Inferiours, when by such our Condescension we may any ways advantage their Welfare and real Interest. And for our doing so, we have in him the most noble Example, that ever yet the World was made acquainted with: For, in this Case we imitate the Condescension of our Lord and Master: Nay, when our Compassion stoops lowest, it only stoops to our *Fellow-Creatures*, those who are made of the same Lump of Clay with our selves, and those who (as Things may fall out) may be as helpful and useful to us again. So that when we *condescend* to relieve *them*, we do, by so doing, *teach* them to relieve *us*, if ever the same, or the like Miseries with theirs, should become our *own*. And we are as sure, that Things may so fall out, as we are sure, that we are Men. Now because our God did condescend to our Nature for the Relief of our Misery, when the *Condescension* and the *Kindness* was only *His*, and when the *Benefit* was only *Ours*; shall not we the rather practise such a charitable Condescension, when by such our Practice we do commiserate at least our *Own possible* Condition? Shall the Son of God, by taking upon himself our Nature, make our Condition *His*, in order

to his *more* sensible Compassion of such our Condition, and shall not we condescend for the Relief of those of our *own* Kind; which, after one Remove, is for the Relief of our *selves*? For, if we be too proud in the Case to *stoop* to our *Inferiours*; yet methinks we should not be too proud to *imitate* our *God*: And if the *Infirmities* of the *one* will not engage us to Condescension in order to *Compassion*; yet one would in reason be apt to think, that the *Example* of the other might do such a thing. We ought therefore, in order to our Exaltation, to learn from him, that to do any good to our calamitous Brother, is not to debase our selves: For our Charity is not the less, but rather the more noble, for being extended to a thatched Cottage; and a personal Visit to the meanest Man, where it is likely to prove beneficial to him, will always wear this Character. That it is a glorious Imitation of the Lord of Glory, who did not disdain a personal Visit to the meanest of his Creatures, whom he had endowed with Capacities of receiving that his inestimable Blessing, without which they must have been for ever miserable.

4. Did our Saviour not only come to us clothed in our *Flesh*, but did he also put on the Form of a *Servant*, in order to the Purchase of our Redemption? Then this his Example should instruct us to do our very best Works with *Meekness* and *Humility*. We are
very

very apt to think our *ordinary* Performances (if in *any* degree Pious) to be *extraordinary* good; and not a few of us put such a Value upon our good Deeds, that we spoil that little Goodness that is in them, by our over-valuing them; and our spiritual Pride, like the Fly in the Box of Ointment, robs them of their good Smell and Savour: But it must be confessed, that in so doing we do not imitate our Lord and Master, who was meek and lowly, and by his Self-denial ascribed such his Good Works, which could not be hid entirely to God's Glory. Why! what Graces we have, do confessedly come from God, the Author and Giver of every good thing; and therefore to ascribe the Goodness of any thing we have, or of any thing we do, to our selves, is Usurpation and Robbery. For we may as well ascribe to our selves our *Natural*, as we may our *Spiritual* Life: Both the one and the other derive from an higher Spring, and from a nobler Fountain. And he who has taught us by his *Word* to account our selves, when we have done all we can, but *unprofitable* Servants, has taught us by his *Example* to do *more*. For, *He* did exactly fulfil the Law, and *his* Obedience was perfect; and yet, for all that, *his* Humility was great. And then, in Reason, because our *Performances* are *less*, our *Humility* ought to be *greater*. For, as *Modesty* should make us humble, when we do *well*; so our *Defect* in
so

so doing, should make us *more* so. And therefore our Saviour's Example, which shewed forth the greatest Humility in the Atchievement of the greatest and noblest Performances, should oblige us, poor, impotent, defective Creatures, to a greater (were that possible) Humility.

5. Lastly, Did our Saviour come down in our Flesh to save Sinners, both from the *Slavery* and *Filth* of Sin, and from the *Wages* of Sin too? Then this should engage our Endeavours to rescue Sinners from the Error of their Ways, and to do as he did, that is, to bring them to God by the Ways of Holiness. This is a noble Lesson, and has our Saviour's *Love* and *Good-will*, as well as his *Holiness*, for its Pattern. For, a Man may be good and holy himself; and yet Self-interest (I mean an allowable Self-interest) may be at the bottom of it: He may fear God's Vengeance, should he be wicked; and so his Goodness may have an Eye to his Security. But he, who endeavours to reclaim *another* Sinner from the Error of his Ways, mixes *Charity* with his *Piety*, by making *another's* Welfare his Aim, and by making more People happy besides himself. Indeed, the Grand Business of our Saviour's coming into the World, was to redeem us from the Slavery and Dominion of Sin, (for, if we be not redeemed from our *Sins*, it is utterly impossible that we should be redeemed from the *Vengeance* of them:)

them :) And therefore he, who endeavours the *Conversion* of Sinners, imitates his Saviour in That, that was his *chiefest* and *noblest* Design. He endeavours to bring Rebel-Subjects under the Dominion of their first and rightful Lord: He endeavours to defeat the Designs of the Devil for their utter Destruction: He endeavours, as far as his little Sphere reaches, to restore the Creation to that Order and Harmony that God gave it, when he first made it. And in all this, he does that which is his greatest Glory; for he copies out the gracious and merciful Work of the Lord of Glory.

C H A P. V.

The Son of God, by his Incarnation, accommodated his Condition for the making good the Expiation of Man's Sin.

IN order to our Vindication of the Counsel of God for the Salvation of sinful Man, so far forth as he has been pleased to make manifest such his Counsel by the Revelations of his Word; we have made it out, that we had brought our selves into so forlorn a Condition by our Sins, that, so far as Reason guided by Revelation can discover, there was no possible Way left for our Redemption, but only by the Incarnation of the Son

Son of God. And in pursuit of such our Design, we have in our last Chapter made it good, That the Son of God was very God and very Man; God and Man united in one Person, or God Incarnate. That this is a Truth professedly and expressly declared in the Scriptures, and that too in such Words, that it is impossible to express any thing whatsoever more plainly or more fully. That what the Spirit so declares in the Scriptures, is in no wise disagreeable to our *Natural Reason*; and that upon both Accounts in Conjunction, it is to be admitted into our *Christian Belief*. For, undoubtedly, whatever God speaks, that is not disagreeable to our Reason, ought by us so to be admitted.

Now because, in order to a Gospel-Salvation, a Gospel-Forgiveness is required; and because, in order to a Gospel-Forgiveness, an Expiation is required; and because we have already made it good, That no mere Creature can by any Means whatsoever make out such an Expiation: Therefore we shall, in what is now to follow, make it our Business to shew, That the Incarnation of the Son of God is (as by the Scriptures, so also) by Natural Reason, the most congruous Means, and the best accommodated, for the making good of such an Expiation. For, we may be very sure, that the All-wise God always makes use of the most proper Means to bring about the Designs of his Counsels: And we may

H

be

be sure also, that where he himself tells us, that he makes use of any Means for the bringing any such his Designs to pass, that what in such a Case he tells us, is Truth. If therefore he tells us, that he employed the Incarnation of his Son for the Expiation of Sin, or that his Son was Incarnate in order to such Expiation; we may, for that Reason alone, (if yet there were no other) be rationally satisfied, that such his Son's Incarnation was a proper Means of bringing to pass such an Expiation. For, the Methods of *God's* Proceedings in any Case whatsoever, are therefore *Wise*, because they are *his*: And if at any time we cannot discover the Wisdom of such Methods, it would be both modest and wise in us to impute the Want of such Discovery, not to the *Impossibility* of the *Thing*, but to the *Short-sightedness* of our own feeble and impotent Capacities. Now all this I therefore speak, not that I think that the Wisdom and Congruity of the Incarnation, in order to the Expiation of Sin, cannot be rationally accounted for, (for, I hope, we shall by and by find it otherwise) but only to check the Confidence of some, who make great Pretences to Reason, (even such Pretences, that they do laboriously and industriously endeavour to bring down the most express Revelations of God to the Standard of such their Reason) but seem to take no care to bring their Reason to an Accommodation with such Revelations.

But

But to return to our Design, which is to make it out, That the Incarnation of the Son of God is a Means wisely, as well as mercifully ordained for making good the Expiation of Sin: Let us first hear what the Spirit saith, who in the Fourth to the *Ephestians*, the Fourth and Fifth Verses, tells us, That *when the Fulness of Time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law*, (that is, his Son was Incarnate, and was under the Law, and therefore made so, as to be obliged to be obedient to it) *to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons.* And when we are told in one place, That *the Son of God was manifested for this very purpose, that he might destroy the Works of the Devil*; and in another, That *he was manifest to take away Sin*: And when to answer to, and explain the Meaning of these Places, we are assured from other Places, that at least one Way of his taking away Sins was *by the Sacrifice of himself*, as in the Twenty sixth Verse of the Ninth to the *Hebrews*; and that *he appeared for that very purpose*, in the same Place: And when we add to all this, what we find in the Fifth Verse of the following Chapter, that *God had prepared him a Body*; and in the Tenth Verse, that *we are sanctified* (that is, our Sins are put away) *through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all, who* (as St. Peter speaks) *his own self bare*

our Sins in his own Body on a Tree: I say, when the Spirit of God does all along in the Scriptures expressly and categorically tell us, That our Saviour suffered in his Body, shed his Blood, lost his Humane Life for our Sins, for the Remission of Sin, for the Redemption of Sinners; when it does in several Places compare his Death to the Expiatory Sacrifices under the Law; when it calls him the *Lamb of God*, (alluding to the Paschal Lamb) *that taketh away the Sins of the World*; when it tells us, that *he is the Propitiation for our Sins*, and the like; It does by these, and such like Expressions (as much as Words can do it) acquaint us at the same time, that he suffered in his Body, and died to atone for and to expiate our Sins. And therefore all the uncouth and forced Interpretations of these and such like Texts (which yet are a multitude) that attempt to evacuate their plain Meaning, may as soon persuade an honest and sincere Man, that the Scriptures both of the *Old* and *New Testament* are a Book full of Collusion and Prevarication, as they may, that *Jesus Christ* our Saviour did not die to expiate the Sins of Mankind. And were I not assured of God's Providence, I should be apt to fear, that the Devil might in time so bring Things about, that if he could upon Pretences of Reason wipe away that Part of the *Bible* that concerns our Saviour's *Incarnation*, and the *Relation* which that has to Man's *Redemption*, that

that he might at last raise his Hopes of blotting out the *whole Christian Religion*. For, to tell us, that our Saviour is only such a Man, as other Men are, but only conceived in a different, and therefore more wonderful manner; to tell us, that he died patiently, tho' wrongfully, only that he might give us an Example of an exact Patience, and of an entire Submission to God's Providence; to tell us, that he was slain a Sacrifice only to *confirm* the Covenant of Grace, but that there was no such Design in his Death, as to *suffer* for, or to *expiate* our Sins; as it is a notorious *Contradiction to*, and not an *Exposition of* the Scriptures; so, for that very Reason, it will appear to have a direct Tendency towards the overthrowing the Grand Design of the whole Book of God: All which, to them who shall scan the Scriptures exactly, is directed *to*, and does center *in* the Saviour, and that Redemption which he purchased for Mankind by his Death and Merits.

Having therefore thus in short taken notice of what the Scripture tells us, concerning the Expiation of Sin by the Sufferings of our Saviour; and having already made it out,

1. That no Creature can by any means expiate the Sin of Mankind; and,

2. That our Saviour is God Incarnate, or God and Man united in One Person, we do, in pursuit of our main Design, lay it down in the

3. Third place, That the Way and Method of Man's Salvation (as it is expressly and frequently laid down in the Scriptures, which is by the Sufferings and Death of the Son of God manifested in the Flesh) is agreeable to right Reason, and exactly congruous to the Measures of Truth, and to the Rules of Justice. And, in order to our making this plain and clear, we take notice,

1. That that Law, about the *Transgression* of which, and the *Release* from the *Penalty* of such *Transgression*, the Gospel-Forgiveness is only concerned, was given to *Man*. For, the Scriptures give us no Account of the Forgiveness of the Breach of any *other* Law, but only of *that* Law, which God had prescribed to *Mankind*. And therefore, tho' in the Scriptures we have several broad Hints of the Fall of the Angels; and tho' our Reason tells us, that that which put them under the Displeasure of God, must needs be *Sin* in the general; yet we are therefore ignorant *what* their Sin was, because we are ignorant *what* that *Law* was, against which they sinned.

2. We take notice, That as that *Law*, about which alone the Gospel-Forgiveness is concerned, was the Law given by God to *Man*; so the Gospel takes no other or farther notice of the *Transgression* of that Law, than as that Law is broke by *Man*. From whence we infer in the

3. Third place, That that Punishment, which the Law threatens against those who transgress it, can only in Justice belong to *those*, to whom the Law was *given* and *directed*. For, they can never *transgress* a Law, who have no Law *assigned* them; and they can never be justly *punished*, for the Transgression of the Law, who can never *transgress* the Law. The Law therefore, about which alone a Gospel-Forgiveness is concerned, being the Law given to Man, and transgressed by Man; Man alone can justly suffer the Penalty of such Transgression. From whence we infer in the

4. Fourth place, That if any Penalty can ever justly expiate that Guilt, which is contracted by the Breach of the Law; that Penalty, that must make such Expiation, must be a Penalty laid upon *Man*. And therefore our Common Sense of Justice will not allow us to think, that either *Angels*, which are ranked *above* Mankind; nor *Beasts*, which are ranked *below* them, can by any Sufferings whatsoever expiate or atone for the Breach of such Law, which being given by God to *Man*, does so far forth *concern* Man *alone*. And tho' we have before made it out, that neither Angels on the one Hand, nor brute Beasts on the other, can expiate the Sin of Mankind, as both the one and the other are *Creatures*; yet what we now say, is, that they cannot do it as they are *different* Creatures.

For, it seems necessary, and that too in the Nature of the Thing it self, that Creatures so different should be under different Laws; and that therefore neither their Obedience to, nor their Transgression of those several Laws, under which they are, should have any such Concern or Relation to one another, as that *one* sort of Creature should in any Case undergo the Penalty of the Transgressions of the *other* sort of Creature. And therefore, for the same Reason that we should look upon it as absurd and unjust, that a *Man* should suffer for the Sin of an *Angel*; I say, for the same Reason, we should think it no less absurd and unjust, that an *Angel* should suffer for the Sin of a *Man*. The Thing might be made out in more Words: But it needs not.

Now these few Remarks being left by the way, to give Perspicuity and Strength to those Things which are to follow; the *Wisdom, Justice, Reasonableness, and Congruity* of the Redemption of Mankind by the Sufferings and Death of our Saviour (as that Redemption is expressly laid down in the Scriptures) will appear from these following Considerations.

1. And first, Our Saviour, who by his Death and Sufferings undertook the Purchase of Man's Redemption, was as really and verily a Man *himself*, as were *those, whom* he undertook to redeem. This is evident, because he is all along in the *New Testament*

called

called *Man, the Son of Man*, and the like, (as we have made it out already.) And this so far accommodates the Scripture-Account of the Purchase of Man's Salvation, to the Law, that,

1. As the Law threatned the Punishment to *Man alone*, and to no *other* Creature; so in the Purchase of the Redemption, *Man alone* suffered such Punishment, and no Creature *besides*.

2. And secondly, As it accommodates the Scripture-Account of the Purchase of Man's Redemption, to the *Law*; because our Saviour, who suffered in order to such Purchase, was a *Man*: So it accommodates the Scripture-Account of the Purchase of Man's Redemption, to the Rules of *Justice*; because our Saviour, who suffered in order to such Purchase, was an *Innocent* Man. It may perhaps at first sight look strange, when I say, that the Purchase of Redemption by the Death of an Innocent Man, is accommodated to the Rules of Justice: But the Wonder will then vanish, when I shall come to make it out, that tho' an Innocent Man cannot without his *own* Consent be *justly* punished; yet that *with* such his Consent, he *may* be so punished. But because That belongs to another Place, therefore in this I pass it by. For, that that I design at present, is only to shew, that it is not agreeable to the Laws of Justice, that a *Criminal* against the Law should expiate

expiate *another* Man's Sin, by suffering the Penalty of the Law: Because the Penalty, which he suffers, being the just Demerit and Wages of his *own* Sin, he cannot, by undergoing the Punishment of his *own* Sin, add any such Desert to such his Punishment, as to make it meritorious of Impunity to any *other* Sinner. As therefore under the last Head we learnt, that he who by his Punishment expiates the Sin of another *Man*, must in Reason and Congruity be a *Man* himself; so under this Head we may learn, that he must be an *Innocent* Man likewise. And so the Sufferings and Death of our Saviour for the Redemption of Mankind, will afford us a further Congruity to the Rules of Reason and Justice, in that that Saviour is exhibited to us in the Gospel, not only to be a *Man*, but also to be an *Innocent* Man.

3. The Wisdom, Justice, and Reasonableness of the Redemption of Mankind, by the Sufferings and Death of our Saviour, as that Saviour was a *Man*, will yet farther and more notoriously appear, if we consider the first *Rise and Formation* of Mankind according to that Account which the Scriptures give us of it: For, there we are told in general, that *God did of one Blood make all Nations of Men, for to dwell on the Face of the whole Earth*, in the Seventeenth Chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*. And then, if we look back to the original Creation of Mankind, and there enquire

enquire more particularly how this was done ; we shall from thence be informed, that God first made *Adam* out of the *Earth*, and that after that he made *Eve* out of *Adam*, (both of them extraordinary and miraculous Productions) and that then, through all succeeding Generations, he formed *all* the rest of Mankind out of *both*, or such succeeding Pairs which *proceeded* from both, (to an understanding Man as miraculous, tho' a more ordinary Production than that of the first Man and Woman.) So that all Mankind are by the Scripture-Account of the Thing a continued Propagation of the Blood of *Adam*, branched out through the several Disseminations of all succeeding Men and Women, from his Days to this present Time. Now our Saviour, as he was Man, took part of this Flesh and Blood, (so the Scripture) and by doing so, became a Part of that Common Blood, out of which all the particular Men in the World are, and always have been made, as well as he. He stands therefore in as near a Relation to all Mankind, as can possibly be made by the same Flesh and Blood ; and that Relation may well be granted to be very near, because it is that very Relation, which the several Parts of a Thing (by continued derivation the same) have to one another. And so far the Relation of our Saviour to the rest of Mankind is in all Circumstances exactly the same with that Relation, which every
other

other Man has to every *other*. But yet there is something peculiar to our *Saviour* in his becoming Man, which does not belong to any *other* Man whomsoever : And that is, that as the first *Woman* was formed only out of the *Man*, so our *Saviour* was formed only out of the *Woman*. And accordingly, the first Promise of Redemption, that God gave to *Adam* after he had sinned, was Prophetically worded, when he told him, that *the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpent's Head*. And therefore, as *Adam* is in the Scriptures called the *first* Man, because he was formed out of the *Earth* ; so our *Saviour* is called the *second* Man in the same Scriptures, because he was formed out of the *Woman* ; that is, *he* was the first Man after *his* Kind, as *Adam* was in *his*. To our present Purpose and Design then : As we cannot but take notice, that God's Counsel and merciful Purpose for the Redemption of Mankind was very early, (for that Counsel must needs be so, that was in a manner Cotemporary to Man's first Sin, as the immediate Discovery of that Counsel to Man upon the Commission of that Sin does make it appear) so some Glimpses of that Counsel do (to me) seem to shew forth themselves in the Scripture-Account of Man's Creation. For, when God tells us in his Word, that he has so ordered the Creation, Propagation, and Dissemination of Mankind, that tho' their Numbers are

to us Innumerable, yet we do for all that know, that they all came from one single Fountain, that is, from one single Man; and so, that they are all but so many Rivulets from that Fountain: And when, moreover, we are assured, that our Saviour is One of those Rivulets; (For, tho' our Saviour was only to be made of the Woman, yet because the Woman was made out of the Man, therefore our Saviour did by the Woman derive from the same one single Person with the rest of Mankind) I say, when we consider all this, methinks it is no hard matter to conceive, that God himself does in his Word lay the Ground-work of Man's Redemption by a Saviour (if I may be allowed so to word my self) in that near and intimate Relation, which our Saviour, by becoming Man, has to all Mankind besides; and that the Intimacy of such Relation consists in this, that the Saviour and all Mankind do derive from one single and common Fountain. And hence we are told in one Place, that *as by Man came Death*, (there is the Sin of *Adam*, and the Wages of such Sin) *by Man came also the Resurrection of the Dead*, (there is the Redemption of our Saviour, and his Purchase.) And more expressly still to our present Purpose, speaks the same Apostle in the same Chapter, (the Fifteenth of the First to the *Corinthians*) *For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive*: And to the same purpose again,

again, in the Fifth to the *Romans* and the Eighteenth Verse, *Therefore as by the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation; even so by the Righteousness of one, the Free-gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life.* In all which Texts, and several others that might be named, it is notorious, that the *Redemption* of Mankind is so ascribed to the *second Adam*, the *Man Christ Jesus*, as the *Sin* and *Death* of Mankind is ascribed to the *first Man Adam*. And I do not at all question, but that those Hints, which the Scriptures do frequently offer to us, of our Saviour's taking the Humane Nature in order to our Redemption, of his taking Part of the same Flesh and Blood with us, of his being our Brother, and the like; I say, I do not at all question, but that, when seriously considered, they may mightily assist and facilitate both our Conceptions and Belief of the Wisdom, Justice, Reasonableness, and Congruity of our Saviour's Incarnation, Death, Resurrection; in one Word, of that Redemption, which he, by being made one with Mankind, by taking their Nature upon himself, has purchased for them: And may mightily conduce to the Removing of those Difficulties which the Enemies of the Cross of *Christ* have thrown as so many Stumbling-blocks in the Way of plain and honest *Christians*.

4. The Wisdom, Justice, Reasonableness, and Congruity of our Saviour's Incarnation,
in

in order to his Purchase of Man's Redemption, does yet farther appear, in that by becoming Man, he put himself into a Capacity of *suffering* Death, that is, of suffering that *Punishment*, which the Law had *denounced* against those that should *transgress* it. For, it is a gross Mistake, and does indeed bring a Scandal upon God's Veracity, to affirm, That he *threatens* greater Vengeance in any Law, *before* the Transgression of it, than he will *execute after* the Transgression, that so he may the *more* effectually *prevent* such Transgression. For, God never yet threatned any peremptory and unconditional Punishment in any Law, which he has not, or, when the Time comes, he will not as certainly execute. *In the Day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*, says God. The Threatning, we see, is peremptory; and the Execution, we find, is so too; and therefore all Sinners die. And I cannot in the least doubt, but that, for the same Reason, an eternal Punishment will be the certain Vengeance upon a final Impenitence. But that is not so direct to my present purpose, and therefore here I pass it by. But, to confirm what I am now upon, I say, that God does not pardon the Death threatned in his Law against Sin, no not in Consideration of the Death of our Saviour; and therefore, notwithstanding *his* Death, and that too in *our* stead, we see, that all Men, and even those who hope for Salvation by such his Death,

Death, do yet die. What therefore our Saviour in this Case has purchased for us, is not a *Freedom*, but a *Release* from Death: And therefore *that* Redemption from Death, which is the Purchase of his Blood, is to be accomplished (after we have been dead) by a *Resurrection*. A Resurrection then is to make good the Purchase of his Death; and therefore his Death purchased for us not a *Freedom*, but a *Release* from our Death by such Resurrection. Now, as his *Death* was necessary for such a *Purchase*; so his *Incarnation* was necessary in order to such his *Death*: And he was therefore made of the same Blood with all Mankind, that by shedding that Blood for Mankind, he might after his own Resurrection restore the Lives of all Men, which had been forfeited by *Adam's* Transgression. So that as his Death was the meritorious *Expiation* of Sin; and as a Resurrection is the *Fruit* and *Effect* of such his Expiation: So his *Incarnation* was a necessary *Forerunner* of such his *Death*; and therefore before he could possibly die for Man, and so purchase a Redemption of Man from Death, it was agreeable to the Laws of Wisdom, Justice, and Reason, that he should become Man himself.

But then, how his Death came to be of so valuable a Price, as to make so glorious a Purchase, we must leave to farther Enquiry. For, by that it will appear, that as it was necessary,

cessary, that he should die the Death of a Man; so it was necessary, that such his Humanity should be united to the Divinity: And by both it will appear, that *God was manifested in the Flesh to destroy the Works of the Devil*; and that therefore, when the Scriptures tell us so much, they tell us no more than what is agreeable to Wisdom, Justice, and Reason.

C H A P. VI.

The Divinity of the Son of God necessary for the Expiation of Man's Sin, as well as his Humanity. Some Doctrinal Inferences. A general Proof, That as our Saviour did actually die, so, that he might justly die for the Expiation of Sin.

HAVING therefore seen, that our Lord *Jesus Christ* was qualified by his Incarnation to make an Expiation for Sin by the Sacrifice of himself; and that such his Qualification is agreeable to the Laws of Justice, and to the Rules of Reason, and Wisdom: Our next Enquiry must be, How such his Sacrifice came to be of such a *Value*, as to be justly *sufficient* to make good such an Expiation. For, because the Death of an Innocent Man (if he be no more than a mere Man) is but the Death of a Creature; and

I because

because no Creature can by its Punishment in another Creature's stead, expiate the Sin of that other Creature ; (for if it could, then a Creature might by its own Punishment expiate its own Sin, both which we have already shewed to be impossible ;) Therefore it was necessary, that as our Saviour, in order to his *undertaking* the Expiation of Sin, should be a *real Man*, a *Creature* ; so, that he should be *more* than a Creature, in order to the *accomplishing* of such his *Undertaking*. For, tho' by becoming *Man*, he did accommodate his *Condition* to his *Design* of undertaking an Expiation (as we have just now seen) yet, for all that, his Humanity had *sunk under*, but but had not *taken away* the Burden, had it not been supported by his *Divinity*. For, that that crushes both Angels and Men, (and that too, while they cope against it only with their own Strength) beyond the possibility of a Recovery, must, for the same Reason, have crushed him also, (when once he had put himself in Man's stead, and by consequence into Man's Condition) had he not been endowed with a Power superiour to both, to enable him to subdue and conquer it. And what Power, but that of God, can we think sufficient to conquer Sin and Death ; and that too, when they had got to such an heighth, as to have infected and over-run the whole Race of Mankind ? Can we think, that when the Contagion and Mischief had spread

spread it self so wide, that even the best of Men (and those whose Graces are chiefly celebrated by the Spirit of God himself) could not preserve themselves from the overflowing Inundation; I say, can we think, that in such a Case any one single Man (were he no more than a Man) could have saved *himself* from the universal Mischief, by the Strength of his own Resolution or Vertue? And if in Reason we must think, that he could not; then how can we in Reason think, that his Strength should be sufficient to rescue and save *all the Rest*? No! Such Salvation belongs only to the Arm of God; and He, who can save from Sin, Death, and Hell, and can over and above extend such Salvation over all the Earth, and that too through all the successive Generations of Mankind, that ever did, or ever shall live upon the Earth, must be God, and God alone. The *Extensive Merit* therefore of the Death and Sufferings of the *Man Christ Jesus*, derives it self from the Infinite Dignity of *Jesus the Son of God*. For, had not this *Jesus* been the Son of *God*, as well as the Son of *Man*, he had never been the *Saviour of Man*. And if *there be not Salvation in any other*, (as in effect the whole Book of God does tell us) it may seem inconceivable, how this Seed of the Woman should extend this Salvation, and so break the Serpent's Head, from the Days of *Adam* to the Consummation of all Things, unless all Things were in

his Disposal, that is, unless he were God. No! He who considers the Thing seriously and wisely, may be satisfied not only by the *Scriptures*, but by his own *Reason* also, that there is the same Mercy, and the same Power required to *redeem sinful* Man, that was required to *make* Man; and that *He* only, who *did* the *first*, *can* do the *last*. And therefore, as we are taught by God, that all Things were made by his Word; so are we also, that this Word was made Flesh, and that by being so made, he became to us, after we were dead in Trespasses and Sins, the Word of Life. From all which, and a great deal more that might be offered, both from Reason, and from Revelation, (some of which Things we *have already* spoken to, and some of which we *shall* have *occasion* to speak to *hereafter*) we may be not only *informed*, but *assured*, That the great Merit of our Saviour's Expiation made for Sin by his Death and Passion, did arise from hence, that his Divinity was personally united to that Body, which underwent such Death; or, that nothing less than the Death of the Son of God could expiate that Death, which the Law had denounced against the Sin of Man. But because these Things will appear in a more full and clear Light, in the farther Prosecution of our Design; therefore we here leave them for a while, and proceed.

For,

For, it having appeared, as to Matter of *Fact*, and that too by most express Declarations of Scripture, that our Saviour was made an Expiatory Sacrifice for Sin ; and it having also appeared, that he did by his Incarnation accommodate his Condition to the making good of such Expiation, and that too in a Way very agreeable to our Natural Sense and Reason : The next Thing to be spoken to, is, the Matter of *Right*, or whether or no he could make such Expiation in *Justice* ? But before we proceed to speak to That, it will be proper that we make some Inferences of weight and moment, from what has been already spoken. And,

1. By what has been said, it appears plainly, That tho' our Saviour made good the Purchase of our Redemption by his Death and Resurrection ; yet that such his Purchase shall not be fully made over to us, till our own Resurrection. That he made good the Purchase, his Resurrection is a Demonstration : For, because the Wages of Sin is Death, and because he died for *our* Sins, and not for his *own*, and because after such his Death he rose again, and because such his Resurrection was a Discharge from the Penalty of those Sins, for which he died ; I say, from all these Things it is evident, that he accomplished his designed Purchase, that is, he made good his Expiation by his Death and Resurrection. But then, on the other side, because it is most

certain, that we are not redeemed from the *Curse* or *Penalty* of the Law, till we are redeemed from *Death*; and because we are not redeemed from *Death*, till we *rise* from the Dead, that is, till our *own Resurrection*; therefore it is as evident, that till such our Resurrection we are not put into the Possession of such his Purchase. And therefore (strictly speaking) no Man (be he who he will) is ~~actually~~ justified in this Life. For, because every Man that lives shall certainly die, and because Death is the Penalty threatned to Sin by the Law; it therefore grates too hard upon our common Sense, to tell us, that any Man is then justified, when he is not only *liable* to the Vengeance of the Law, but when he is also sure in a little time to *undergo* such Vengeance. If therefore any Man be, according to a Gospel-estimate of Righteousness, a righteous or good Man, we may upon that Account say, (and we shall say true) that he is in a justifiable Condition; but we cannot truly say, that he is a justified Person. Justification then in the Execution belongs to a *future* Life, and not to *this*. And when we shall come to discourse on the second Thing contained in a Gospel-Salvation, which is a Restitution to Holiness, and the Consequent of it, the Gift of Eternal Life, we shall then be more fully satisfied, that Justification cannot belong to any Man in this World, because no Man in this World is restored to that

that Holiness, which was lost by the Transgression of the Law; and because no Man shall be compleatly and actually justified, till he be so restored.

2. Because the *Expiation* of our Sin by our *Saviour*, and by consequence the *Pardon* of Sin by *God*, is not Absolute, but Conditional; and because some of those Conditions, upon which such Pardon does depend, are to be performed by us, such are our Repentance, Conversion, and the like; and because, lastly, our Condition in this World is such, that there will of necessity be required *Time* for our Performance of such Conditions: Therefore we do conclude, that as our Saviour has purchased for us such *Conditions*, in order to our Redemption; so has he also purchased for us a *longer Term*, in which we may *perform* such Conditions. For, it is evident, that the Denunciation of the Law upon the Transgression of it, is, [*In the Day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*] And in strict Justice and Reason, the Punishment is *then* to be inflicted, *when* it becomes *due*; and it then becomes *due*, so *soon* as the Law is *broken*: For, were it not due *then*, it would never become due *at all*. Now because we find, and that too by Experience, that notwithstanding not only *Adam's Sin*, but our *own Sins* too, we do not presently die; but that God waits our Return, that he may be gracious to us; and because we know, that such his Pati-

ence and Forbearance is therefore extended to us, that we may by our Repentance qualify our selves to be made Partakers of that Expiation, which is made by our Saviour, (for, *there is not Salvation in any other*) therefore we do at last conclude, that the Grant of a *Space for Repentance* is the Purchase of our Saviour. For, it would have been the same thing for our Saviour to have made no Purchase for us at all, if such his Purchase had been clogged with such Conditions on our Part, which it was utterly impossible for us to perform: And it had been utterly impossible for us to make out our Repentance, and Amendment, if we had not been allowed a competent Time to make them out in.

And what we have said concerning God's allowing of a competent *Time* in which Sinners may perform the Conditions of the Covenant purchased by the Saviour, that we say also concerning the *Means* which are necessary for such their Performance: Such are his Word, the Succours and Assistance of his Spirit, his Sacraments, and whatever else does usually come under the Title of *Means of Grace*. For, it is not conceivable, that our Saviour should purchase for us the *End*, and yet leave us without the *Means*, which are necessary for the bringing about such End. But yet because the Means to enable us to perform the Conditions required of us in order to our Salvation, are not, nor indeed can possibly

possibly be that very Salvation, for which they are designed or employed as means; and because, while we live in this World we are required, and it is necessary in it self, that we always have, and also employ such Means to the purpose of our Justification; and lastly, because it is so far from being necessary, that it is neither proper, no nor wise, to employ any Means for any End already attained; therefore what we observed under our last Head, will still remain true; and that is, That no Man is actually justified in this Life.

3. From what has been said, we take notice, That tho' Afflictions in this Life are undoubtedly the Executions of Justice; yet (which is owing to our Saviour's Purchase) there are always couched in such Afflictions Designs of Mercy. For tho', as they look *backward*, they have an Eye to our *Sins*; yet, as they look *forward*, they have an Eye to our *Amendment*, or, at least, to our *Restraint*. For, had we died for our Sins, according to the Law, we had been both immediately *punished* for our Sins *past*, and had by the same Means been *prevented* from ever sinning for the time to *come*. (For, a Death without a Resurrection, had proved a sure and everlasting Prevention.) But (as we have seen) our Life being continued in consideration of our Saviour's Purchase (tho' Afflictions are laid upon us during the Reprieve) and tho' such Afflictions do confessedly come from

from the Hand of Justice ; yet they are never laid on without a Design and Mixture of Mercy : And therefore, as they are the *Punishments* of Sins *past*, so they are designed as Means of *Grace* for the time to come : And by the wise Counsel of our merciful and gracious God are employed (chiefly indeed for our future *Reformation*) but at least for our future *Restraint* ; and so are one, and a great Branch too, of what we call *Restraining Grace*.

As therefore we took notice under our last Head, that the Reprieve of Man from the immediate Execution of the Sentence of the Law, was the Purchase of our Saviour, and that so Man's Life came to be continued, notwithstanding his Transgression ; so under this Head we may observe, that tho' Sin, during such Continuance of Life, cannot be restrained by *Death* ; yet the Just, Merciful, and All-wise God has not, even in such Circumstances, left it without all *Restraint* ; but has by Afflictions fitted such a Curb for it, which (notwithstanding the Saviour's Purchase) is an irrefragable Proof of his Justice : But tho' it be so, does in no wise *encroach* upon such Purchase, but rather *promotes* the Design of it. For, a Life continued in order to the Performance of those Conditions, by the Performance of which Man, in and through his Saviour, may obtain Salvation ; A Life, I say, continued to such a Purpose, is more

more likely to answer to such Purpose, if its Attempts after sinful Commissions be restrained, than it could be, were such Attempts left free and at large. For which Reason, such Restraint, tho' it be caused by Afflictions, does rather *fall in with*, than *controul* the Design of our Saviour's Purchase. And tho' it be confessed, that such *Restraint* is not so efficacious for the Prevention of future Sins, as *Death without any Reprieve* had been, (for, in the *last* Case the Prevention had been *necessary*, whereas in the *first* it is at the most but *possible*) yet it must be confessed also, that it is most wisely suited to the Circumstances of those, about whom it is employed; and that for this Reason, Because all Restraint being designed either to *keep* or to *make* them Good, it is necessary, in order to either, that it be left to their own *Choice*, whether they will improve it to *either*, or *both* Designs, or no: For, there can be no Goodness at all, without such Freedom. By all which we may at last understand, that tho' Afflictions, as well as Death, are the Wages of Sin; and tho' God does not let the reprieved Life of a Sinner pass on without the Tokens of his Displeasure, that is, in the present Case, without Afflictions; yet that it is owing to our Saviour, that all such Afflictions are employed as Means of Preventing Grace: Whereas otherwise, the Prevention of Sin by a Death without a Reprieve, that is, a Death without

a Saviour, and so without a Resurrection, had been no Means of Grace at all, but only pure and mere Punishment.

4. Lastly, From what has been said, I take notice, that our Saviour, by his Expiation of Sin, did not purchase for us an *Absolute* Freedom from Death, so that by vertue of such his Expiation we should not die *at all*; but only a *Release* from Death, so that after our Death we should be *raised to Life* again. This I spake to before; and the thing is as certain, as it is certain, that all Men do die; and therefore I shall speak no farther to it at present: Only one *Quære* I would make upon it, and that is this; Whether, because the *Law* required *Death* as the *Punishment* of Sin, and because our *Saviour*, for the *Purchase* of our *Redemption*, and for the *fulfilling* of the *Law*, was necessitated in his *own* Person to *undergo* Death; I say, Whether upon this Account God, by a Mixture of Mercy and Severity, might allow his Expiation to extend no farther than only to *release* us from Death *after* we had suffered it, but not to *prevent* us from suffering it *at all*? But, as I said before, I leave this as a *Quære*, because the Scripture speaks nothing to it, and so the Resolution of it lies in the dark. Only I thought it not amiss to mention it, because it may help to instruct us in the very great Malignity of Sin! As most undoubtedly that must be very pernicious to God's Creatures, which is down-
right

right Enmity to him, who made them, and which is not wholly expiated by our Saviour himself.

However, the Wisdom and Harmony of God's Truth, Justice, and Mercy do seem to me, from what has been said, to shine forth very conspicuously in his Counsel for the Redemption of Mankind.

For, tho' God *executes* that Death upon Man *fatally*, which, upon his Transgression of the Law, he *threatned peremptorily*; and so, notwithstanding the Death of our Saviour makes good the Truth of his Threat by the Execution of the Penalty: Yet for all that, he does not so execute such Penalty, but that he first allows Man a Reprieve for a time, to make himself a fit Subject for his Saviour's Purchase; and, secondly, he grants him a Release from Death by a Resurrection, to capacitate him to be put into the actual Possession of such Purchase.

Again, tho' the Life of Man, continued in Consideration of his Saviour's Merits, be ever and anon overcast with Afflictions; and tho' such Afflictions are a Punishment for his Sins, and so a Proof of God's Justice: Yet still those very Afflictions are, in Consideration of his Saviour, turned into Means of Grace, and so are a merciful Discipline to secure him from those Mischiefs, which otherwise might retard or defeat his Pursuit after the purchased Pardon and Inheritance.

These

These Remarks being left by the way, we proceed to the next thing proposed, and that is, Whether our Saviour, as he did in Fact, so also might in *Justice* and *Right*, die for the Sins of Mankind? For, because the Scriptures do lay down the Matter of Fact not only in *express* Terms, but also in great *variety* of Expressions; and because those who deny the Doctrine of the Expiation, do in this Case, as they do in most others, oppose Reason to Revelation: Therefore, as by what has been said already, we have made it out, that our Saviour *did* die for our Sins; so, in what is to follow, we shall endeavour to make it out also, that he *might* so die. For, if the Matter of Fact be found to be the Declaration of God, we may be sure, that it will have the Approbation of Justice: For, Justice and Truth can never clash nor interfere. But however, before we begin, I cannot but take notice in the

1. First place, That the Redemption of Mankind by our Saviour, is one of those Things of God, which no Man knoweth, but the Spirit of God; and that, upon that Account, it is not so proper a Subject for the Deliberations of Humane, that is, of short-sighted Reason. And my Warrant for so judging I therefore take to be good, because it was a Thing (as the Scriptures themselves tell us) that was hid from Principalities and Powers, from Ages and Generations, till it was

was made known by God to his Church, that is, to those who were *chiefly*, and, as to their *own* Persons, *only* concerned in it. And therefore we are very sure, that no Man, by the Sagacity of his own Reason, could ever have made any Discoveries of it.

2. I cannot but be satisfied, in the second place, that any Man of an ordinary or of an extraordinary Understanding, who is willing in honesty and sincerity of Heart to receive the Scriptures as the Revelations of God; I say, I cannot but persuade my self, that such a Man (and that too by the bare Conduct of his Common Sense) would readily acknowledge and accept it for a Truth in those Scriptures revealed, that our Saviour suffered and died to expiate the Sins of Mankind: For, the Texts that assert it, are so often repeated, and, when compared, do so mutually not only *confirm* each others *Truth*, but also *explain* each others *Meaning*; and the Management of the whole Thing is so exactly accounted for, and that through all the Stages and Periods of it, till our Saviour comes to offer his Sacrifice to God in the Heavens, the Place of his more peculiar Residence and Abode (as the High-Priest did typically in the like Case do in the Holy of Holies, the more peculiar Discovery of God's Residence among the *Jews* under the Law :) I say, all these Things are so categorically asserted and explained, and so critically accounted

counted for in the Revelations of God, that I cannot as yet persuade my self, that Common Sense, and Common Sincerity will not oblige those to receive and believe them, who are willing to receive those Books, in which they are so laid down, for the Word of God.

3. Neither can I persuade my self, that Reason, if it be not spun too fine, (and what is so, may easily break) but, I say, I cannot persuade my self, that Reason, upon a sober Examination of the Matter, (as it is laid down in the Scriptures) can in any wise call in question the Justice of it. For, as it is there laid down, there are only three Persons more especially concerned in it, and those are, God, our Saviour, and Man. Let us therefore take the Sum of the Business in these Three Propositions, and then see, if our honest and natural Reason can discover any Injustice in it.

And, First, God does forgive our Sins in Consideration of our Saviour's Sufferings.

Secondly, Our Saviour did suffer in our stead, in order to the obtaining of such Forgiveness.

Thirdly, We do obtain such Forgiveness in Consideration of such his Suffering.

Now if we set our plain and honest Reason on work to examine, whether there be any Injustice in this whole Transaction; that will readily tell us, that if there be any such Thing as Injustice in it, that Injustice must
be

be attributed to some of the *Persons* concerned in it. For, in this Case, it is not sufficient to say, that the Transaction, either in the Whole, or in any Part of it, is unjust, unless we do particularly assign that *Person* engaged in it, to *whom* that Injustice does belong. For, all Injustice in Matters of Fact must be ascribed to some *Person* or *other*: And no Injustice, in any Matter of Fact whatsoever, can be truly ascribed to any Person whomsoever, if that Person be supposed to have nothing to do in that Matter of Fact. Now, in the Case, as it is put, there are (as we observed just now) no other Persons concerned, but God, our Saviour, and our selves. If therefore the Thing prove to be, as by the Revelations of God it will be found to prove, that we Sinners are reconciled to God by the Sufferings, Death, and Merit of our Saviour, and so are pardoned for our Sins; then it will follow, that if there be any Injustice in the Case, that Injustice must be either ascribed to God, to our Saviour, or to our selves.

Now there cannot possibly be any Injustice in *us*, because we are purely *passive* in the Case: For, so far forth as we are forgiven, (and that is as far as we are concerned) most certainly we are so. And we may be very sure, that Reason will never tell any Man, that he is therefore a Criminal, because he receives a great Blessing from God; and least of all will it tell him, that it is a *Sin* in

K

him

him to *receive* from God the *Pardon* of his Sins.

And I dare not so far question the Modesty of any Christian, as to suppose, that they will fix any Injustice in the present Case, either upon God, or upon our Saviour: And therefore because no Injustice can be charged upon any of the Persons concerned in the whole Affair; therefore, if we be but once satisfied, that God himself has told us in his Word, that the Affair was so managed, (as most certainly so he has told us) then the Conclusion at last must be, that there was no Injustice in it at all. I say, I am satisfied, that this would be the way of Reasoning to a sober and modest Christian; and that this would be good and satisfactory, if Men would with Modesty and Humility bring their Rational Sentiments to comply with the Scriptures, and not industriously struggle to force the Scriptures to comply with their own prejudicate Opinions or Surmises. For, in a Thing of that Depth and Counsel, as is the Redemption of Mankind, I am sure it is much more *safe*, as well as more *modest*, to comply with the Declarations of God, whose Counsel and Work it is, (and that too especially, where, as we have seen, a sober and modest Reason falls in with, and approves such his Declarations) than by a more refined way of Reasoning, and a more tedious and intricate Deduction of Consequences, (where

(where any little Flaw or Mistake may spoil the whole Concatenation, and at long run determine in Deceit and Fallacy) downright to controul and contradict such Declarations. For, God is our best and most sure Guide in all things: And then, when he professedly undertakes to be so, and that too in such Things, that our Natural Reason knows nothing of, without such his Guidance; it would be the best Use that we can possibly make of such our Reason, in all such Cases to follow his Conduct. For, in this very Case, God has himself told us, that he has *confounded the Wisdom of the Wise. For, Christ crucified was to the Jews a Stumbling-block, and to the Greeks Foolishness.* And it has before our Days been thought very good Reason, that he therefore could not save *others*, because he could not save *himself*. Tho' I cannot persuade my self to doubt, but that That, and all other Methods of Reasoning, that attempt to make out the Injustice of his Suffering in our stead, or any other ways to evacuate the Merit and Purchase of his Blood, will in the conclusion prove frivolous and empty; and that they will be found light, even in the Balance of Reason it self.

But to carry this Business a little farther: As we have made it out, that sober and sound Reason will warrant the Justice of Man's Redemption, if it was so managed, as we have laid it down; so, that it was so managed, we

may be as much assured by the Word of God, as we may of any other Thing contained in that Word. And hence we are told, that God made our Saviour to *become Sin for us, who knew no Sin*, 2 Cor. 5. ult. That *he reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ*, in the Eighteenth Verse of the same Chapter: He tells us also, that *he was reconciling the World to himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them*, in the Verse immediately following. And that we may be assured, that God does all this in Consideration of our Saviour's Death and Passion, we are told in one Place, that *he died for our Sins*; in another, that *the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all Sin*; in a third, that *being justified by his Blood, we shall be saved from Wrath through him*. All which, with a great deal more to the same import, that might be alleged, amounts to thus much; That our Saviour took upon himself our Sins, and in our stead died for them; and that thereupon God pardoned such our Sins, and was reconciled to us. Now, because *God himself tells* us such a thing, and that too in as plain and expresse Words, as any thing can possibly be told in, we may be very sure, that what is so told, is plain and open *Truth*: And because at the same time he *tells* us, that what was so done, was done by *himself*; we may moreover be sure, that what was so done, was *just and right*. However, thus far we are certain,

certain, that if in the present Case we will be contented to be determined by the Word of God, that then there neither are, nor can be any Laws of Justice, that can hinder our Saviour's Suffering in our stead, in order to our obtaining the Pardon of our Sins by such his Suffering.

The Answer then to what shall be alledged against such Justice, we shall defer to the next Chapter. Only before we break off here, we cannot but take notice, that the Doctrine of our Saviour's Expiation, as it *has* in part already, and will more fully hereafter appear to have more *Truth* in it, than what is alledged against it; so also it will appear to have more *Comfort*. For, if there be no other Name, whereby we must be saved; it must needs be very imprudent at least to refuse to admit our own Salvation in and by him: And it is a Doubt at least, whether they, who deny his Expiation, the Purchase of his Blood, and the Forgiveness of Sins in Consideration of his Death, do not so refuse it. And it is at least another Doubt, whether those, who refuse it upon such Considerations, do not refuse it altogether. The Scriptures do at least seem to tell us so: And they will give but an ill Account of their Prudence, who will so far hazard their Salvation, as to gratifie their Obstinacy in an Opinion, that does so palpably controul God's express Declarations.

C H A P. VII.

Answers to Three Objections. 1. The Punishment was in Justice only due to us, not to him. This Objection retorted upon the Socinians. 2. That his Death was but a Temporal Punishment; but the Expiation pretended to be made, was of an Eternal Punishment. 3. The Absurdity, that God should suffer for the Satisfaction of his own Justice.

BUT notwithstanding the Multitudes of such Declarations in his Word, which do avowedly and professedly acquaint us with this great Truth; yet for all that, it has met with many Adversaries: Who, as they have endeavoured by odd and very uncouth Interpretations to expound away the plain and categorical Assertions of such Declarations; so have they also to back such their Expositions with Arguments taken from Natural Reason. Now it may be reasonably expected, that those Reasons should be very good, and well-grounded, which pretend to make good such an Interpretation of God's Word, which at first View is a downright Contradiction to such Word. And because all those Interpretations, which attempt to annul the Expiatory Sacrifice of our Saviour, are such; therefore, before we proceed any farther, we cannot

cannot but take notice, that it looks presumptuous at least to *pretend to measure*, and much more is it so, to *controul* the Justice of the Divine Counsels and Actions, laid down expressly and frequently in his acknowledged Word, by so uncertain a Standard as Humane Reason; because it is impossible, that such Reason should comprehend all Possibilities; especially such, which are confessedly brought to pass by the more signal and extraordinary Power of an Omnipotent Arm. But however, because such Attempts have been made, we will consider *some*, and the *chief* too, of those Allegations which have been offered in opposition to those plain and express Discoveries, that God in his Word has made to Man, of the Method of his own Proceedings in the Forgiveness of their Sins.

I. And first, It is pleaded against the Justice of our Saviour's Suffering in order to the obtaining of our Pardon, that such Sufferings cannot therefore be just, because in Justice and Equity they are due to *us*, and not to *him*. For, since the Justice of the Punishment must arise from the Demerit of the Delinquent, the Punishment can in Justice be only laid on there, where the Demerit is lodged. And therefore, if our Saviour was not the *Sinner*, (as most certainly he was not) neither ought he in Justice to be the *Sufferer*. And to confirm this Way of Arguing, we have the Voice of God himself assuring us,

that the Father shall not suffer for the Iniquity of the Son, nor the Son for the Iniquity of the Father, (that is, one Soul shall not suffer for the Sins of another) but the Soul that sinneth, that shall die, in the Eighteenth of Ezekiel. And, which is yet a great deal more, God does there appeal to the Sense of Mankind for the Equity and Justice of such his Proceedings. Now then, if every Sinner ought in Justice to bear his own Burden, how can it possibly be just, that the Punishment of our Sins should be laid upon another, who was in no wise guilty of those Sins? And then, lastly, if the Vengeance due to our Sins could not in Justice be laid upon another; then neither can it be true, that God does therefore remit such Vengeance to us, because our Saviour has suffered in our stead. And by consequence, the Forgiveness of our Sins cannot either in Reason or Justice depend upon our Saviour's Sufferings. And if it does not, then it must be a Mistake at least to affirm, that God's Forgiveness of our Sins is just and equal; and yet at the same time to maintain, that he does forgive them in Consideration of our Saviour's Sufferings. The Objection (you see) looks plausible at the first sight; but yet, when it comes to be strictly examined, will (as will appear by and by) signifie just nothing. For,

1. There is no doubt made by any of Mankind, that we know of, but that in some Cases

Cases one may become a Surety for another; and that if the Principal fails in the Performance of his just Obligations, the Surety (so far as he stands bound for him) is obliged in Justice to answer and make good such Obligations. This among Mankind is taken as a Thing granted in all those Pecuniary Obligations, which do relate to Commerce or Traffick: And therefore it is generally allowed, that he who is bound for the Payment of another Man's Debt, upon default of Payment in the original Debtor, does become Debtor himself, and, as such, is bound in Justice to make good the Debt to the Creditor.

Nay, we may go farther yet, and by doing so, may advance one Step nearer to our main Design. For, as all Mankind are agreed, that the Surety stands bound in Justice to pay the Debt, upon the Non-payment of the Principal Debtor, where such Debt is contracted by *Commerce* or *Traffick*; so also they have the same Sense of the Surety's Obligations, where the Debt is contracted by the Principal Debtor's *Crime* or *Delinquency*. Now it is agreed on all Hands (for Common Sense tells all Men so) that a Debt contracted by a Crime is a Punishment, tho' it be but a pecuniary Punishment. And then, if a Surety, upon the Failure in the Principal, be bound in Justice to pay *such* a Debt; it will be so far from being a Doubt, whether a
Surety

Surety in such a Case may justly undergo the *Punishment* of the Criminal; that in deed and truth he is bound, and that too in Justice and Honesty, to undergo it. From whence we conclude, in the first place, that it is so far from being absolutely true, that one Person cannot *justly* suffer the Punishment due to the *Crimes* of another; that, on the contrary, it may so happen, that he may be *bound*, and that too in *Conscience*, to take up on himself such Punishment.

2. To which we add, in the second place, That in such a Case, where one Person undergoes the Punishment due to the Crimes of another, the Punishment so inflicted can so much the less be taxed of Injustice, if the Person, who undergoes it, do undertake it *freely* and *willingly*. And therefore, tho' it be true *in Thesi*, that is, in the general, that it is Injustice to punish an Innocent Man for the Fault of a Criminal; yet *in Hypothesi*, or in a particular Matter of Fact, it may not be unjust so to do. And the Reason is, because any Punishment (be it what it will) can only be unjust with relation to that Person who undergoes such Punishment. For, if he does justly undergo it, then, let the Punishment be what it will, yet still it will be just. Now, where a Person does willingly, freely, and of his own accord submit to a Punishment; there the Punishment, tho' he did not by his Crimes deserve it, cannot therefore be
thought

thought unjust, because it would be an odd and unheard-of kind of Injustice to any Person, to injure him by fulfilling his own Desires, and by gratifying his Choice. If then we apply this to our Saviour's Sufferings, which he underwent in our stead, we may be informed by him himself, that *he laid down his Life*, and, that *no Man took it from him*; that is, he laid it down willingly. And because he did so, therefore tho' God laid upon him, and accepted from him the Vengeance due to our Sins, in order to our Acquittance; yet he did him no Injury by so doing, because he was willing, as our Surety and Proxy, to undergo and suffer such Vengeance. Indeed it is not to dissembled, that because the Sin was *Ours*, and not *His*, that God therefore might, and that justly too, have refused the Punishment to *be his*, and not *ours*. But then, withal, we must take notice, that tho' God *might* have done so; yet that there was no Law of Justice, that either did or could *oblige* him so to do. And therefore, to clear that, or any other Doubt that may arise from what has been spoken upon this Head, we add,

3. In the third place, That where that Person, who willingly suffers for another's Crime, has an undoubted *Right* and *Title* in all those Things, and an *uncontroulable Power* to dispose of all those Things, which are either *damnsified* or *lost* by such his Sufferings:

In

In such a Case, as there is no Injury done to his *Person*, by reason of his *willingness* to suffer; so neither is there any Violence offered to any *Law of Justice*, by reason of such his *undoubted Right*, and *absolute Power*. Now at once to clear this Matter, and to bring it up to the Point we aim at, we must take notice, that our Saviour tells us himself, in the Tenth of *St. John* and the Eighteenth Verse, *I have power to lay down my Life, and I have power to take it again*. And Reason tells us the same Thing: For, because *he made the World*, and because *all things were created by him and for him*, and because for these Reasons alone he is the Almighty God; therefore there can be no question, but that he may justly challenge to himself that Power, which the Supreme God claims, as his most undoubted Prerogative, *I kill, and I make alive*. To which we may likewise add, that he is to be *Judge both of Quick and Dead* (as even that *Creed*, which goes by the Name of the *Apostles*, and even our Adversaries too, in the present Case, do allow.) Now it cannot in the least seem reasonable, that he should have the Power of *Damning and Saving*, who has not the Power of *Life and Death*: For, it must needs sound harsh to our Reason, to grant him the *greater Power*, and in the mean time to *deny* him the *less*. Taking it therefore for granted, that he had an absolute and uncontrollable Power to dispose of his

his Life as it seemed best to his own Wisdom; if he was pleased so to dispose of such his Life, as to lay it down in our stead, and for our sakes, there could not possibly lie any Obligation of Justice upon God, to bind him up from accepting the Offer of such his Sacrifice; because such a Power does in it self suppose, that there neither is, nor can be any Injury, that should forbid such an Offering. And we know well enough, that any thing may be lawfully done, against the doing of which there is no just Law. And therefore the Case of our Saviour, in the present Instance, does so far forth differ from all the Cases of all other imaginary Innocents in the World. For, tho' another Man be supposed to be Innocent, yet he has no such Power over his own Life, as to dispose of it as he himself shall please: And if he should by any Means destroy it without his own Demerit, it would be in him Self-murder, and that too, tho' he should offer it for a Criminal. But if he should so order his Life, as to deserve Death; then that very Crime, that forfeits his Life, would spoil his Innocence too. And therefore should a Magistrate, who is invested with the lawful Power of the Sword, accept the Life of an Innocent in lieu of the forfeited Life of a Criminal, he would therefore become a Criminal himself; because in such a Commutation he allows the Innocent Man to become a Criminal, by usurping upon
the

the Prerogative of God himself. Which may serve to shew the Fraud and Deceit of that way of Arguing, which will not therefore allow it to be just, that our *Saviour* should offer his Life, as a Sacrifice for Sinners, because it cannot be justly allowed, that *other* Innocent Persons should do so: Whereas the Life, which our Saviour offered in the present Case, was entirely his *own*, and absolutely at his own *disposal*; which yet cannot be truly affirmed of the Life of any *other* Innocent Person in the World (if yet we should suppose such a Person) from the Days of the Creation, to the Consummation of all Things. As therefore we learned by the *last* Head, that God might have *refused* to accept our Saviour's Death in our stead; because the Life offered was not the *same* that was forfeited, but *another*: So, by what has been spoken under *that* Head, and *this*, we may now perceive, that there is no Reason in Law or Justice, why he might *not* accept it. For, if our Saviour might have become Surety for the Discharge of that Debt, which by the Tenor of the Law we owed to Justice, by our Transgression of the Law; and if, upon our Inability to pay such Debt, so as to obtain our Acquittance, he was willing, and fully impowered to lay down his Life, in order to our Release and Discharge; and if God might in Justice accept the Offering of such his Life for so gracious and merciful a Purpose: Then
the

the whole Objection against the Justice of his Suffering in our stead, and for our sake, vanishes, and comes to nothing.

These Things I have pursued thus far, to put the whole Matter in a true Light, and to lay it down just as it is: Tho' I do frankly confess, that I do not think the Objection against our Saviour's Sufferings, taken from the Injustice of such Sufferings, to be of any force at all, no not upon those very Principles, upon which they go, who make it. For, they themselves allow our Saviour to be Innocent, and by consequence (tho' they make Death a Natural Thing, which, by the way, is but an Heathen-Notion of it; for it does not in the least agree with what the Scriptures teach us about it :) But, I say, they themselves allow our Saviour to be *innocent*; and therefore they must allow, that he did not *deserve* that Death, which he suffered. But then they tell us, that God did therefore permit him to undergo such a cruel and hard Treatment, that he might be an Example of Patience, Submission, and Resignation, to all Men, in any Circumstances, under which they should be brought by God's Providence; and that he was slain a Sacrifice to ratifie and establish the New-Covenant, that God then made with Man in order to the Pardon of Sin. By which it is notorious, that they endeavour to vindicate God's Justice from those Ends and Designs of his Providence or Mercy,

cy, for which God delivered up his Son to a cruel and bloody Death, tho' he did not deserve such Death.

1. Now we are very well assured, in the first place, that our Saviour was *delivered up to be crucified and slain, by the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God*. For so St. Peter expressly tells us, in the Second of the *Acts* and the Twenty third Verse. And again, we are told in the Fourth of the *Acts* the Twenty seventh and Twenty eighth Verses, that *Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the People of Israel, were gathered together, to do to him, whatsoever God's Hand and Counsel determined before to be done*. We know also, that his Crucifixion was prophesied in the *Old Testament*, and that in sundry Places; and that he himself does both foretell it in the *New Testament*, and does there also tell us, that it was plentifully foretold in the *Old*. And we know, lastly, that what was foretold some thousand Years before it was brought to pass, and then was so actually brought to pass, as it was foretold, must be foretold by God: The Certainty of the Event, in such a Case, being a Demonstration, that Omniscience gave forth the Prediction.

2. We are assured, in the second place, that our Saviour being perfectly Innocent, as having never transgressed the Law, could not possibly *deserve* the Death of the most hainous

nous Malefactors, a Death attended with Agony and Torment, tho' he did *suffer* such a Death.

3. It is agreed, in the third place, between us and our Adversaries, That because our Saviour did willingly submit to the Counsel and Determination of God, in suffering such a Death; that thereby God's Justice is sufficiently assailed and vindicated (to which we spake more largely just now) and that by such his Submission he gave an Example to Mankind, under any Affliction, of an entire Resignation to the Counsel and Will of God, in all Cases whatsoever.

4. But then, in the last place, it may be reasonably demanded, how it comes to pass, that these self-same Sufferings, this self-same Death of our Saviour, do then become unjust, when they are affirmed to have been undergone by him for the Expiation of Man's Sin? They were just, because he underwent them willingly; and they were honourable, because they were exemplary; and we are sure they were merciful and charitable, if they were expiatory: And then, shall what is just in it self, and honourable, because it is designed for an Example, or for any other End; I say, shall such a Thing therefore become unjust, because it is over and above designed for a Charity and a Mercy? The same Thing (we know) may be directed to more Ends and Purposes than one; and those se-

L

veral

veral Ends and Purposes may all be good and warrantable ; and where they are so, there (if the Thing be good and just in it self) we may in Reason rest satisfied, that one of those good Ends will no more vitiate and corrupt it, than any other End will. If therefore the Death of our Saviour were just *without* being design'd for an Expiation ; it will remain just still, tho' it *be* design'd for an Expiation. For, Mercy and Compassion (which are undoubtedly included in such Expiation) are most undoubtedly just and good Things, when they are designed and brought to pass by just and lawful Means. And therefore, when the Adversaries of the Expiation do tell us, that the *Death* of our Saviour was just and lawful, they do with the same Mouth-full of Breath contradict their own Objection against the Justice of the Expiation, and do as good as tell us, that the *Expiation* is just and lawful too. When therefore *Socinus*, and his Followers, do in very tragical Expressions (and some of those Expressions so indecent and irreverent, to say no worse, as not fit to be mentioned) exclaim against the Injustice of the Expiation ; it is notorious, that they *quit* their *Reason*, and *fly* to *Harrangue* ; that is, they hope in this Case to prevail by their *Rhetorick*, rather than by their *Arguments*. For, I can hardly persuade my self to believe them so short-sighted, as not to perceive, that any Argument against the

the Justice of the Expiation does not contradict such their own Positions, which maintain the Justice of our Saviour's Death and Passion.

One Thing more I would remark, and then I shall proceed; and that is, That because the Objection under this Head is only laid against the *Justice*, but not at all against the *Value*, *Merit*, or *extensive Influence* of our Saviour's Death; therefore I have precisely stuck to the Matter of the present Objection, without mixing other Things with it relating to the Expiation; that is, I have here only asserted the Justice of our Saviour's Death, in order to the Expiation of the Sins of Mankind.

2. The second Objection against our Saviour's Expiation of our Sins by his Death, stands thus: and that is, That tho' it should be granted, that he had Power over his own Life, that he was willing to lay down that Life, and that God was willing to accept it; yet all this will amount but to *part* of Payment: For, first, the Death that we deserved by our Sins was *Eternal*; but that which he suffered in our stead, was but *Transient* and *Temporal*. It is confessed, that as the *Socinians* do deny the Expiation, so do they also an Eternity of Punishment: But yet that does not at all take off from the Force of the Objection; because if they, who maintain the Doctrine of the Expiation, do also assert

an Eternity of Punishment, it is sufficient for their Confutation to shew, that their several Doctrines do contradict, and so overthrow each other. The Objection then being so far laid right, it goes on further, thus : The Sins of Mankind are the Sins of Many, of Thousands, of Millions, of Myriads, nay, of Multitudes of Myriads ; but the Death of our Saviour was only the Death of One : So that if either we consider the *Extent* of our Guilt, or the *Malignity* of it, it will by no means seem reasonable, and therefore neither just, that the single Death of our Saviour should be looked upon as a proportionate Expiation of it. Nor indeed would it, according to those who make the Objection ; who (tho' the Apostle tells us in one Place, that *in him dwells all the Fulness of the God-head bodily* ; and in another Place, that *being in the Form of God, he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*) will yet, in spite of these, and a Multitude of other express Declarations to the contrary, still allow our Saviour to be no more than a mere Man. Now it is freely confessed, that if the Case were so, then his single Death would be no valuable Compensation for the Death of *all* the Sinners in the World ; and much less would it be so for the *eternal* Death of such Sinners. But since the Scriptures have over and over told us, that his Death was such a Compensation ; and since such a Compensation cannot

not exceed the Dignity of that Character, which the same Scriptures have given us of him, tho' their Way of Reasoning says otherwise; I dare leave it to any sober *Christian* to judge, whether it does not more concern them to answer what the Scriptures do object to *them*, than it does us, in the present Case, to answer what they do object to *us*. For, if the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt in our Saviour bodily, and so was united to and with that Body; then it will be no inconceivable Strain to imagine, that the Infinite Dignity of the Person suffering must needs add an immense Value to such his Sufferings, and by so doing must make them more than adequate to the Guilt of all Mankind. And tho' this of it self may be sufficient to stop the Mouth of the present Objection; yet if we do but recollect some few Things, that have been spoken to, and made good already, we may still be farther satisfied, that the Objection against the Value of his Sufferings, in order to the Expiation of the Sins of Men, will be of no force at all. If we do consider therefore, that because our Saviour took on him the Nature of *Man*, and not of *Angels*, that he did therefore *die* for Men and not for Angels: If we consider, that the *fallen Angels* are left without any hope of Escape from the Vengeance of the final Judgment, which *Man* is not: If we consider, that the Vengeance which the *fallen Angels* shall then suffer, will

never work out their Redemption, or Forgiveness; and that for that very Reason, because that Vengeance shall be *eternal*: If we consider, that neither would eternal Vengeance work out the Salvation of any *Man*, for the same Reason: And lastly, If we consider, that notwithstanding the utter Impossibility of Man's satisfying the Divine Justice by his own Punishment: yet we are assured by the Voice of God, that ~~some~~ Men shall obtain Redemption by their Saviour's Blood, even Remission of Sins: I say, if we consider all these Things, our Natural Reason will help us to conclude, that the Death of our Saviour, tho' it were but the Death of *One*, and tho' it were but a *temporal* Death neither, yet will do that, which all the Eternal Deaths in the World could not do; that is, it will reconcile Sinners to God, and from him obtain their Pardon; and that upon that single Account, it is of more Value in his Sight, than the Death of Angels and Men; and that therefore he, who suffered that Death, was infinitely greater than both. By which we may also understand, that if there be any Absurdity in the thing, that one Person, by his single and temporal Death, should satisfy the Divine Justice for the Sins and Demerits of so many; they, who make the Objection, do make the Absurdity too; because, in their Opinion concerning the Person suffering, they do degrade him below that
Infinite

Infinite Station and Dignity, in which the Scriptures do assure us, that he stands exalted.

3. The last Objection against our Saviour's Expiation of Sin, and that which does indeed rather attempt to prove the *Impossibility*, than the *Injustice* of the Thing, is this ; That if our Saviour be God himself, and if this very Saviour did die to reconcile Sinners to God ; then it will follow, That God suffered to reconcile Sinners to himself : Which, at at the very first sight, looks absurd.

1. And so it may indeed, to Humane Reason, which in many other Things, but more especially in the Things of God, is very often guided by dark and blind Measures. But still the Apostle twice tells us, in the Second to the *Corinthians*, chap. 5. ver. 18, 19. That God was reconciling us, and reconciling the World to *himself*, and that he did this by *Jesus Christ*, whom yet the same Apostle in another Place calls, *God over all, blessed for ever*. Now, in the Contrivance and Enterprize of this Reconciliation, he was the first and principal Agent ; and so indeed the very Beginning of the Reconciliation came from the offended Person : Nay, it was he, who contrived the whole Method of Reconciliation ; (for, *it was hid from Ages and Generations, from Principalities and Powers*, till God made it known to his Church.) And that we may not think, that there is any Absurdity in this

his doing, he does in this very Case, as far as our Circumstances will allow, command us to follow his Example. For, in the Eighteenth of *St. Matthen* and the Fifteenth Verse, he requires, that *if our Brother offend us*, we (that is, we the Offended) *should go and tell him his Fault*. So that, tho' the Injury be done, not *by* us, but *to* us; yet *we* must make the first Step towards a Reconciliation. Now, a Man of a worldly Reason would in this Case be apt to cry out, What! must I begin to give my self Satisfaction? Is this Sense or Justice? Did not he do the Injury? And is not the whole Reparation to come from him? But, *God's Thoughts are not as Man's Thoughts, nor his Ways as Man's Ways*. And therefore, tho' your *Enemy* began the Injury; yet, if he commands, *you* must begin the Reconciliation. And if God do not only *begin* the Reconciliation in the Case before us, but also *suffer* himself, that he may compleat it; all the Inconvenience that will follow from it, will be, that God can do more than Man: For, he can do any thing, that is not *unjust*; and any thing, that is not *impossible*. And, as we have already made it out, that it is not unjust; so we shall go on farther, to make it out, that it is not impossible.

2. For, secondly, our Saviour being (as we have already made it out) a Middle Person between God and Man, a Mediator in his *Person*, as well as in his *Office*; as he was

not

not so *Man*, but that he *was God*; so he was not so *God*, but that he *was Man*. And then, if we add, that as *Man* he suffered for the Sins of *Man*, so much may be allowed now, because so much has been proved already. And indeed, strictly and closely speaking, it was *Man*, not *God*, who suffered in the Person of our Saviour. For *God*, we are sure, is utterly, and in his own Nature, incapable of any such Thing, as that is, which we call Suffering. So far forth therefore as the Objection surmises, that we take *God* to have suffered; so far the Objection is mistaken and laid wrong. But yet,

3. Because *God* and *Man* were personally united in our Saviour, and so made up but one *Christ*; therefore our Reason will tell us, that the Sufferings of such a *Man* must receive an immense Value from his Personal Union with *God*. Take the Thing in an Instance, and it will be much more plain, and satisfactory. A *Man* strikes a Prince. No one will say, that he strikes his *Dignity*, (for the thing is impossible) but only his *Body*. But yet to think, that the Injury and Malignity of the Stroke shall not be rated, as well by his *Dignity*, as by his *Body*, would be an Imagination, that an ordinary Reason would condemn of Weakness. And therefore, tho' the Bodies of all Men are made of the same Flesh and Blood, and so the wounding of a Prince is no greater a natural Hurt to him, than

than the wounding of a *Peasant* is to *him*, (supposing their Wounds to be equal or alike) yet we know, that the Difference of their *Conditions* shall make such a vast Difference in the *Value* of the Mischiefs done by the several Wounds; that, in the *first* Case, the Fault of such Mischief shall be esteem'd *Capital*; when perhaps in the last it shall hardly be thought *Penal*. The Sufferings therefore of the Man *Christ Jesus* might be sufficient for the Expiation of the Sins of Mankind, not because his Deity *suffer'd* with his Humanity; but because he being *IMMANUEL*, his Deity gave an *Infinite Value* to the Sufferings of his Humanity, by being Intimately, because Personally, united to it. And therefore, as my Reason suggests to me the Certainty of the Union of his Deity with his Humanity, from the Expiation made by the Value of the Sufferings of his Humanity; so from the Union of his Deity with his Humanity, it rather suggests to me, that he is One Person of the Deity, than that his Deity suffer'd for the accomplishing of such his Expiation. And I cannot but think, that the Arguments already offered will in a good measure warrant such a Suggestion: And therefore, to what has been already said, I add in the

4. Fourth place, That tho' the Expiation of the Sin of Man was *one* Design both of our Saviour's Incarnation and Sufferings; yet
that

that it was not the *whole* Design of such his Sufferings, and of such his Incarnation. For, he came *to destroy the Works of the Devil*; the Kingdom, which the Devil had set up in this lower World; to recover sinful Man from that Revolt that he had made from God, and so to restore him to his Duty and Allegiance to his Sovereign Lord and King (as will appear more fully hereafter.) And to this purpose, as it was necessary, that he should *purchase to himself a peculiar People zealous of good Works*; so it was necessary, that he should free such People from that State of Sin, in which they were in Bondage, and by doing both, establish a Kingdom of Holiness and Righteousness, in lieu of a Kingdom of Sin and Darkness. His grand Design then was the *enlarging* of his Father's Kingdom, by restoring to it what the Devil had torn off from him. And then, if for the *accomplishing* of such his Design, the *Expiation* of Man's Sin; and if for the *Expiation* of Man's Sin his *own Death* was necessary; it will be no great strain to conceive, that the Man *Christ Jesus*, united to the second Person in the Trinity, should do and suffer what he did, for the fulfilling the Will of God, by restoring and so enlarging his Kingdom, by subduing his Arch-enemy, and by taking his usurped Dominion out of his Hand, and asserting it to himself. For, all this our Saviour did, when by those Methods, with which
the

the eternal Wisdom has acquainted us in his Word, he builds up a Kingdom of Righteousness out of one of Rebellion and Wickedness: Which Kingdom, when his Work is fully accomplished, he will (which was his main and grand Design) resign up to God, the natural and rightful Lord of all Kingdom and Dominion: See *1 Cor. chap. 15. ver. 24.* Tho' therefore our Apprehensions may be startled, when we undertake to conceive, that the Son of God, the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the Word of God, by whom he made the Worlds, should suffer to reconcile Man (who had made himself his Enemy by Sin) to himself, in order to Man's Pardon: Yet when we consider, that by the same Undertaking, he re-settled his Father's Kingdom, asserted his Honour and Dignity, displayed his Mercy, and in Conjunction with that maintained his Justice; and that by doing all this, he exhibited God to the World, not only a faithful Creator, but also a gracious and loving Redeemer: I say, when all these Things are considered, our Wonder and our Incredulity may not only *abate*, but *cease*; and we may be rationally satisfied, that it was as well worth our Saviour's Sufferings, to bring all these Things to pass, (tho his Enemy Man had his Interest in it) as it was for him to make Man at first.

Now, what we have said, is a sufficient Answer to the Objection, upon supposition, that
any

any or every Sin is of so malignant a Nature, that the just Punishment of it shall be Eternal. But tho' there be such a Thing, as Eternal Punishment, most expressly asserted by the Scriptures, (and therefore we do by no means question the Truth of it) whatever the *Socinians* may pretend to the contrary; yet perhaps it is not so certain, that the Scriptures do allot any *such* Punishment to any *other* Sin besides *Unbelief*, or (which amounts to much the same Thing, tho' in other Words) a *final Impenitence*. For, it is most certain, that all *other* Sins, if they be truly and heartily repented for, shall, in Consideration of our Saviour's Merits, be *forgiven*; and it is as certain, that no Man shall undergo an eternal Punishment for *those* Sins, which shall be *forgiven*. If therefore we do assert, what is most true, that our Saviour did not die to save Unbelievers, or Impenitent Sinners; and that they are the *only* Sinners, to whom *eternal* Punishments are assigned; in such a Case, the Objection, that his *temporal* Punishment could not take away an *eternal* Punishment, would be of no force; because, in such Case, *eternal* Punishment was not *designed* to be taken away. For, every Unbeliever, and Impenitent Person, shall suffer it, notwithstanding our Saviour's Death: And there do not want very good Probabilities (and those too in no wise disagreeing to Scripture-Revelations) that the Sins of those, whose

whose Sins shall not be pardoned after the Resurrection, shall have just so much Punishment, as they do in Justice deserve, (be that more or less) but that such their Punishment shall not *therefore* be eternal, because such their Sins did *deserve* such eternal Punishment; but because they *refused* and *rejected* those easie Means, which God had provided in a Saviour, by a due Use of which they might have escaped all Punishment whatsoever. Now, because it is absurd to imagine, that our Saviour *underwent* Death to save *those* who should *slight* or *reject* that Salvation, which he purchased by his *Death*; and because *none* but such, who do so, shall, by the Tenor of the Gospel, suffer *eternal* Punishment; therefore it is no Objection against the Merit of our Saviour's Death, to say, that his *temporal* Death cannot expiate an *eternal* Punishment, because he did not suffer Death for any such Purpose; and he did not do so, because he did not suffer Death for *those*, who *alone* shall suffer eternal Punishment; that is, he did not suffer Death for those, who shall refuse and reject the only Means of Salvation, which he purchased for Mankind by his Death.

Much more might be offered upon this Occasion; but this being sufficient in this Place, I shall therefore here add no more.

In the mean while, I do not question, but that the Value of our Saviour's sufferings is
full

sufficient to expiate the Guilt of *any* Sins, for whose Expiation such Sufferings were designed; tho' such Guilt should be supposed or allowed to deserve *eternal* Punishment of it self.

And from the Whole, that has been spoken on this Subject, we do at last conclude, That a Release from the Vengeance due to Sin by the Law, and purchased for Man by his Saviour the Lord *Jesus Christ*, who for Man's sake made his Soul a Sacrifice for Sin, is a *just* and *legal* Pardon, and agreeable to the Measures of *Right Reason*, and to the *Laws of Justice*.

For, because the *Pardon* of Sin does imply in it a *Desert* of Punishment in the Party *forgiven*; and because the *laying* the Punishment which *he* deserves, upon *another*, is in effect a *Remission* of that Punishment to *him*; and because, lastly, a *Remission* of Punishment to the Party, which *deserves* such Punishment, may be truly accounted a *Pardon* of his Sin; (For, Pardon of Sin to any Party whomsoever, is neither more nor less, than the Releasing or Freeing him from the Punishment due to his Sin :) Therefore, if, by what has been spoken, it has appeared, that the Punishment due to *our* Sins was, *without* any Injustice, translated upon *another*, and that upon such Translation it cannot justly be exacted of us; then it will follow, that so far forth as our Sin was pardoned, so far forth the Pardon was just.

And

And therefore, so far as we have hitherto gone, we may truly and rationally conclude, That that Method, in which the Gospel discovers our Salvation to be brought to pass, does exactly square to the Rules of Right Reason and Justice. For, so we have seen, that it does in the first thing, which a Gospel-Forgiveness does imply and contain in it; and that is the Pardon of Sin.

C H A P. VIII.

Bare Pardon of Sin not sufficient for a Gospel-Salvation: Some Reasons offered for it. They, who are entitled to the Reward of the Law, must be entitled to the Obedience paid to the Law. Such Obedience must be perfect. Some Practical Reflections.

THo' we have hitherto asserted the Sufficiency of our Saviour's Sacrifice, for the-Expiation and Pardon of Sin; yet it must be confessed, that *bare Pardon of Sin*, upon any Considerations whatsoever, (be those Considerations never so valuable) yet can never in Reason or Justice make out a *Gospel-Salvation*. And therefore, we laid it down at the Beginning, that as, in order to a Gospel-Salvation, there was first required an *Expiation*, and, in consideration of such Expiation, a *Pardon of Sin*; so there is also required

required a *Restitution* to Holiness, and the *Gift* of Eternal Happiness. For, because God's Law (as every good Law besides) does consist of Two Parts; First, the *Directive*, or what it requires to be obey'd; and, Secondly, the *Vindictive*, or what upon Disobedience it requires to be suffered: And because Sin is the *Disobedience* to, or *Transgression* of the Law: Therefore, so far as we have discoursed of the Justice of the Pardon of Sin, so far we have only discoursed of *that* Justice which concerns the *Vindictive* Part of the Law. But by doing *that*, we have not at all discoursed of *that* Justice, which concerns the *Directive* Part of the Law. And if, upon our neglect to follow such Directions, God does, for any Reasons whatsoever, *forgive* us the Penalty, which we incur by such our Neglect, and *nothing more*; it must be confessed, that by *such* a way of Proceeding, all Care of the *Directive*, which is indeed the *principal* Part of the Law, is *thrown away*. For, because all Men are Sinners, that is, because none do obey the Law; tho' God upon valuable Considerations do *remit* the Punishment to *some*, or *all* of those Sinners; yet still it is certain, that the *Duty* enjoined by the Law remains *undone* by all. And I therefore say, it is certain, because it will notoriously appear by what follows, that the Pardon of Sin, that is, the *Pardon* of the Transgression of the Law, (tho' such Pardon be granted by God, and

obtained by us, in Consideration of our Saviour's Suffering in our stead) can never pass for the *Performance* of the Directions of the Law; that is, can never pass for that Righteousness, which consists in an Obedience to such Directions; and therefore (as we shall see more fully hereafter) can never be sufficient for our obtaining a Gospel-Salvation, which includes in it an eternal *Holiness*, and an eternal *Happiness*, as well as the *Pardon* of Sin.

Now, that the *Pardon* of our *Transgression* of the Law, can neither in Reason nor Justice pass for our *Performance* of the *Directions* of the Law, will appear notorious from these following Considerations.

1. Because *Forgiveness* does imply in the very Notion of it a *Desert* of Punishment; and a *Desert* of Punishment does imply in it the *Transgression* of the Directions of the Law. For, no Man can be *truly forgiven*, who does not *justly deserve* to be *punished*; and no Man can *justly deserve* to be *punished*, who does not *transgress* the *Directions* of the Law. Now, for the same Reason, and upon the same Account, to esteem a Man *Innocent*, and yet a *Criminal*, must needs be absurd, because it is a Contradiction. And then, because in Contradictions only one Part can be true; therefore, so sure as we are, that he, who is *truly forgiven*, must be a *Sinner*, so sure we are also, that he neither is, nor can be *truly supposed* to be *Innocent*. And therefore

fore, when God forgives, as it is supposed in Reason and Common Sense, that he does forgive *Sins*, and is so expressed in general in the Scriptures; so it is supposed in the same Reason, and the same Common Sense, that he does forgive those Sins to *Sinners*. And therefore we cannot be supposed to have obeyed the Directions of the Law, upon the Account, that God does forgive us the Punishment threatned in the Law.

2. Nor can we be so, secondly, Because should we *undergo* the *Punishment* which the Law threatens; yet we could not by so doing ever *fulfil* the *Directions* of the Law. For, it is notorious in it self, that the *suffering* what the Law *threatens*, is not the *doing* what the Law *commands*. Now, it is certain, that the *Forgiveness* of that Punishment, which we have deserved, can give us no better a Title to Obedience, than our *suffering* such Punishment could have done, had that Punishment *not* been forgiven. And it looks absurd at first view, that *Guilt* should consist in the neglect of *Obedience*, and that *Punishment* should be the *Desert*, and therefore in Justice the *Effect* of our *Guilt*; and yet that *Obedience* should be the *Effect* of our *Punishment*: That is, that *Guilt*, after one Remove, should be the proper, and in a manner natural, because juit Cause of Duty. But, we may be therefore sure, that it is no such matter, because we are told by God himself, that

there is a Punishment after this Life, which shall be Eternal ; which yet would be impossible, if the suffering of Punishment were equivalent to a perfect Obedience to the Directions of the Law : Which, because for the Reason *alledged*, and for *more*, that *might* be *alledged* ; it cannot be, therefore neither can the *Forgiveness* of such Punishment be so. For, it is evident, that the *Forgiveness* of our Punishment can do no more towards the making us *obedient*, than the *Punishment* it self could do, should we *undergo* it. And therefore the Pardon of our Sins for the Sake of our Saviour's having suffered in our stead, does not of it self suppose us to have fulfilled the Directions of the Law.

3. The *Forgiveness* of our Sins does imply nothing more in it, than our *Freedom* from that Vengeance, which the Law has *threatened*, and which *we* have *deserved* by our Transgression of the Directions of it ; and so does only free us from the *vindictive* Part of the Law : But does not, for that Reason, entitle us to those *Rewards*, which the Law promises to those who *obey* its *Directions*. Now, it is a very different Thing to be barely *freed* from the *Vengeance* of the Law, and to be *entitled* to the *Promises* of the Law ; because the Case may really so be put, as that a Man may *obtain* a *Release* in the *First* Case, and yet never be *entitled* to, or *possess* the *Promise* in the *Last*. And in all Cases (let them
be

be what they will) yet still we are certain, that the *First* can only in Reason, nay, in Nature, belong to *those*, who have *transgressed* the Law; and that the *Last* can only in strictness of Law belong to *those*, who have *obeyed* the Law: And therefore, that the *First* can be only Matter of *Favour*; whereas the *Last* may be Matter of *Right*. Now, if there be any *Difference* in the Two Cases, then, let that Difference be lodged where it will, yet we are from thence assured, that the Cases are not the *same*; and therefore, neither can the *Forgiveness* of our Sins upon the Account of our Saviour's suffering the Vengeance of the Law in our stead, be any Argument, that we have *fulfilled* the Directions of the Law.

And therefore, tho' it be affirmed by several Learned Men, that we are sufficiently entitled to Eternal Happiness by the bare Pardon of our Sins, in Consideration of our Saviour's Sufferings; and that for this Reason, because when we are treated by God with *Impunity*, we are at the same time treated as *Innocents*; and that *he*, who is *treated* as an Innocent by *God* himself, (who cannot be mistaken in the Case) must therefore needs be so.

Yet these Men, as they do not sufficiently distinguish between an *Innocent* and a *Saint*; so neither do they between *Impunity* and a *Reward*. For, tho' our Saviour's Sufferings are meritorious of a *Reward* to *himself*, (and

so the Scriptures tell us;) yet they are only *expiatory* to us; and that too in the Nature of the Thing. For, the utmost Design, the natural Tendency, and the only Business of an Expiation, is to obtain an *Impunity* for *such*, who have *deserved*, and therefore must in Justice, without such an Expiation, *suffer* Punishment. But neither Scripture, Reason, or Justice will tell us, that a Purchase of *Impunity* from the Vengeance due to the *Transgressors* of the Law, can be a Purchase of that *Reward*, that is *only* due to *Obedience* to the Law. In one Word, Reward and Punishment derive not only from *different*, but from *contrary* Principles: And *Impunity* has, and that too in the Nature of the Thing, a Respect or Relation only to *Punishment*, but none at all to *Reward*: And for that Reason, the meritorious Cause of Impunity can have no Concern with *Reward* neither. Since then the Death of our Saviour is the meritorious Cause of *Pardon* to those, who have *transgressed* the Law; it is absurd in Nature and Reason to make it also the meritorious Cause of that *Reward*, which, as it supposes no need of Pardon, so does by the Law only *belong* to those, who have *obeyed* the Law. So that an *Expiation* does at the most but make a Man *Innocent*, but does nothing to make him a *Saint*: For it only *cancels* his Neglect of Duty, but does not *do* that Duty for him, which he has neglected.

By

By all which it appears,

1. That *Reward* does in Propriety and Justice only belong to *Obedience* to the Law.

2. That *Punishment* does in Propriety and Justice only belong to the *Transgression* of the Law.

3. That *Expiation* has no Relation to the Reward of Obedience; but that it only concerns that *Punishment*, which without such Expiation is in Justice due to *Disobedience*.

Now because God has taught us, not only that our Sins shall be *forgiven* in and through our Saviour; but that also, in and through the same Saviour, we shall obtain a glorious *Reward*: And because (as has appeared in general) *Reward* does in Reason and Justice as properly belong to *Duty* and *Obedience*, as *Forgiveness* does to *Expiation*: Therefore our next Enquiry must be, upon *what* Obedience such Reward is grounded. For, we are very sure, that, because the Distribution of such Reward is lodged in *God's* Hand, therefore the Reward will be bestowed *justly*; and because we are sure of *that*, therefore we are farther assured, that it will be conferr'd upon *Duty* and *Obedience*. And indeed, having in what went before seen what Provision God has made for the fulfilling the Vindictive Part of the Law, in order to the Possibility and Justice of Man's Salvation; and being satisfied, that *that* Provision, which he has made for *that* purpose, will *not* also fulfil the

Directive Part of the Law ; it must be our next Business to enquire, what *Provision* he *has* made for the *fulfilling* of such *Directive* Part. For,

1. In the first place, We may therefore be certain, that it shall be fulfilled one way or other ; because the Law being God's, is in it self Holy, Just, and Good. And we know, (and that too by the Light of Nature) that it cannot be an indifferent Thing to the Ever-wise, and most Holy Law-giver, whether a Law, which is so, be obeyed, or not. For, that would be in effect to cast off all Regard to Duty, Holiness, and Righteousness. Nay, (which is yet more) because every just Law must for that Reason, even because it is just, design the *Obedience* of them, for whom it is made ; I say, because it must *principally* and in the *first* place design their *Obedience*, and not their *Punishment*, (and therefore not their Forgiveness neither) it would be in effect to contradict his own Design, in giving forth his Law. For, the Design of his Law being the Holiness of his Creatures, resulting from their Conformity to the Directions of such Law ; if he should *so* pardon their Neglect of such Conformity, (that is, the Neglect of their Obedience) as to make *no* Provision for such Obedience ; it is evident, that by so doing *he* would have no more Regard to the Directive Part of his own Law, than *they* have had ; and so the *Manner* of
For-

Forgiving the Transgression of the Law would unravel the main and principal *Design* of making the Law. But, we know very well, that such a Way of Proceeding is neither agreeable to Wisdom, nor to Holiness; and therefore much less to Infinite Holiness and Wisdom. And therefore, if the Ever-Holy and Wise God *gave* up his beloved and only begotten Son to *Death* for the accomplishing the *vindictive* Part of the Law; and if for the same purpose he punishes all Mankind, not only with many *Miseries* in *this* World, but also with *Death* in their going *out* of it: I say, if he does all this, (which yet he himself tells us is *his strange Work*) that so the *vindictive* Part of the Law may not fall to the Ground; shall we think, that he will do *less*, or indeed shall we think, that he will not rather do *more*, to make good the *main* and *grand*, and, I may add, the more natural Design of his Law, which is the Holiness of his Creatures? No! we are sure, that no Word of God shall return empty; and that therefore his more solemn and express Declarations (and such are his Laws) shall be sure to have their Accomplishment, and shall be fulfilled in their due time, notwithstanding the counter-Endeavours of Hell and Wickedness. For, it shall not be in the Power of any Enemy to defeat the Counsels, or evacuate the main Design of that Law, which proceeds from Eternal and Essential Holiness,

Holiness, and which moreover is backed with Omnipotence. We may therefore very well be satisfied, that God has made Provision for the Performance and fulfilling of the Directions of the Law, as well as of the Vengeance of the Law.

2. And we may be satisfied, in the second place, that such his Provision does and must extend it self to *Man*, to *whom* the Law was given. For, it would be unreasonable to imagine the Design of any Law to be fulfilled, when such Law is not obeyed by any of *those*, for *whom* it was proclaimed, and to whom it was given. And therefore, because the Law was given to *Man*, and requires Obedience from *Man*, we cannot say, that the Design of the Law is fulfilled, unless *Men* do obey it.

3. We may be satisfied, in the third place, that *no* Man in this World (except our Saviour alone) *has* obeyed the *Directions* of the Law, from the Days of *Adam's* Transgression, to this very Day. And we may be satisfied moreover, from so long an Experience of the Thing, and from Reason grounded upon such Experience; but, if both will not do, we may be satisfied from Scripture, that no Man ever *will* or *shall* pay a perfect Obedience to such Directions. Nay, it is notorious, that *no* Man does so, because we know, that every Man in this World is under the *Curse* of the Law; and we know, that every

Man

Man is so, because we are assured, that every Man in his going out of the World shall *undergo* such Curse, that is, that every Man shall *die*. Now, Death being the Penalty expressly assigned by the Law to the Transgression of the Law; we may be sure, that those, who are not only *liable* to such Penalty, but who shall also certainly *undergo* it, are *Transgressors* of the Law. And then, because that is the Case of *all* Men in this World, we may from hence also conclude, that *all* Men in this World are *Transgressors* of the Directive Part of the Law.

4. We may be satisfied, in the fourth place, (both because it is the Object of each good *Christian's* Faith and Hope in particular, and because it is an express Revelation of the Will of God in general) that *some* Men shall be *saved*; that is, shall obtain an Eternal Happiness in another World; tho' we know most assuredly, that *all* Men do *transgress* the Law in this World. Now, because it is impossible in Justice, and absurd in Reason, that Vengeance and Salvation should *both* be the Recompence of the Transgression of the Law; and because, tho' all Men are Transgressors, and *some* of those Transgressors shall be pursued with *Vengeance*, yet *others*, upon the Account of their sincere, tho' imperfect Obedience, shall be rewarded with *Salvation*: Therefore we do infer in the

5. Fifth place, That those who shall be so rewarded, shall, in order to such their Reward, be then entitled to a perfect Obedience, when such Reward shall come to be bestowed: That this is a Truth laid down in the Covenant of Grace, the Covenant by which alone Men shall obtain Salvation: That Reason and Justice do fall in with such Covenant, in asserting and maintaining the same Truth; and that therefore it is every way firm and good. For, it sounds harsh to our natural Sense of Justice, that without a *perfect* Obedience a Man should obtain that Reward, which in Justice and Reason can only be allotted to *such* Obedience. For, an Obedience that falls *short* of Perfection, is in truth and reality (whatever it is called) a *Transgression*: And so is so far from *deserving* a Reward, that it does indeed *stand in need* of a *Pardon*. For, the *Defect* of such Obedience is *Sin*; and Sin mixed with *any* thing, corrupts the *whole*, and makes it unclean and impure; and we know, that nothing that is so can enter into the Kingdom of God. And therefore, in order to his Salvation, St. Paul renounces *his own Righteousness*, which is of the Law, in the Third to the *Philippians*, and the Ninth Verse. Alas! the very best of us in this World have our Failings and Imperfections; and not only sinful *Weaknesses*, but sinful *Wilfulnesses* also: Nay, our very Righteousnesses are but filthy Rags; And then we
may

may be satisfied, that we shall never in those Rags be admitted to the Marriage-Supper of the Lamb. When the Prodigal Son returned to his Father, the Father not only provided the *Feast*, but the *Robe* and the *Ring* too, to qualifie his Son to be a *fit* Guest for such a Feast.

Now from these Propositions, so laid down and confirmed, it may seem no very remote Consequence, that *that* Righteousness, to which those, who shall be saved, shall be entitled, in order to such their Salvation, shall be the Righteousness of *that* Person, whom the *New Testament* sets forth to be the *Saviour* of Mankind. For, their Salvation must in Justice and Reason depend upon their *Obedience* to the Law; otherwise such Salvation can in no Sense be truly reckoned a *Reward*. And if that Obedience, to which such Reward is by the Law assigned, were entirely their *own*, then that Person, whom yet the Scriptures call their Saviour, could in no Sense be truly so called, because in such Case their Salvation would be their *own legal* Purchase, as being the Reward of their *own* Obedience. And lastly, to suppose the Saviour to be therefore their Saviour, because he bestows upon them Salvation, in Consideration of an *Imperfect* Obedience, that is, an Obedience which is so far from deserving Salvation, that it does indeed *stand* in need of a *Pardon*, is to suppose him to bestow the Reward
there,

there, where the Law does *not* lay it ; that is, upon Supposition that such Law is Just, it is to suppose him to be Unjust. From all which, the Conclusion at last must be, That since their Saviour must save them for their *exact* Obedience to the Law, (if he save them *justly*) and since we are sure, that he does save them *justly*, tho' they have paid *no* such Obedience ; that therefore the Method in which he saves them, is by entitling them to a perfect Obedience. Now, how that is done, will be our Business to make out ; as also, that the Manner of his doing it is just and righteous, and therefore reasonable. By which it will appear, that our present Way of Reasoning does not want its Weight, tho' perhaps it may at present seem too light to demand an Assent. But before we proceed to that, we shall offer a few Practical Reflections upon what has been already laid down.

1. And first, From what has been said, we may easily perceive, that God is not so fond of our Persons, or of our future and everlasting Happiness, as to provide for such our Happiness, by his own Neglect or his own Law. For, *Heaven and Earth shall pass away ; but one Tittle of his Law shall not do so.* Tho' therefore we can easily allow our selves to break his Law, and make light of his Commands ; yet we may therefore be sure, that *he* will not do so, because his Commands
and

and his Laws are Holy. For, it is a foolish and vain Imagination to think, that essential Justice and Holiness, that is, in other Words, that God will put Sights upon himself, to gratifie those with Impunity, and much less with Glory and Immortality, who put Sights upon Holiness, by sinning against his Laws. The truth of it is, because *we* are fond of *our selves*, and very desirous of our own Happiness, we are (ay! and the very best of us too) too apt to think that *God* is so too; and in this Case we are foolishly inclined to think him to be *altogether such an one as our selves*: And this makes us to entertain *soft* and *easy* Thoughts of his *Mercy*; and in the meantime to have no *due* Regard to his *Justice*. But, if we would but consider, that both his Mercy and his Justice are guided by his Holiness; and that as he will not *punish* us without our *Demerit*, so neither will he *reward* us unless we become *righteous*: I say, if we would but seriously consider this, it might be an effectual Means to engage us to look better to our Ways; lest whilst we think we are on our Journey towards Happiness, we be found by Mistake to tread in the broad Road, that leads to Destruction.

2. From what has been said, we may learn where to seek and to find what we do all naturally desire, and that is Happiness. I say, we may learn, that it is only to be
sought

sought wisely, and to be *found certainly* in the Ways of *Holiness*. For, tho' our Sins may be expiated by the Death of our Saviour; yet when we have made our selves Sinners, we are not sure that we shall be made *Partakers* of such Expiation, and so we are not sure of the *Pardon* of such our Sins; and we are sure, that *without* returning to the Paths of Holiness, we shall *not* be made Partakers of such Expiation, and that therefore we shall only *enjoy* the *Benefit* of it, when we are *found* in such *Paths*. The most certain Means therefore of *making* our selves *happy*, will be by *keeping* our selves *holy*: For, so long as we do so, we keep our selves within the reach of the Gospel-Promises; and tho' our Holiness be not in this World perfect, yet (as we shall see shortly) God will provide a way to make that and our Happiness perfect in another World.

3. By what has been said, we may learn, how it comes to pass, that we have no sincere and entire *Happiness* in this World; and that is, because we have not here any sincere and entire *Holiness*. For, were we freed from all *Sin*, we should be also freed from all *Misery*. For, we mistake, if we do not think, that Croakes, Losses, Pains, Sicknes, and Death, are all of them the Effects of our Sins: And we may be sure, that they therefore are so, because we are sure, that when our Sins are done away, all these Miseries shall

shall be taken away too. No! Sin is mixed with our Life; That spots, stains, and corrupts it; and so Affliction and Misery come to be mixed with it too. And therefore, were Sin once banished out of this lower World, and true Righteousness planted in its Place; were God's Will done in Earth, as it is done in Heaven; his Kingdom would presently come, and the Glories and Beatitudes of Heaven would certainly flow in upon all those, who have arrived to a perfect, that is, to an Heavenly Holiness. Since therefore we may be so easily satisfied, that it is Sin, and Sin alone, that impairs our Happiness, and that too (that Happiness which most of us love so well) our Happiness in this World; one would think, that this Consideration single, and by its self, should engage us to *hate Sin*, as much as we *love* such our *Happiness*; and therefore also to endeavour to *encrease* our *Happiness*, by *destroying* our *Sins*.

4. If our Good Works are so full of Flaws and Imperfections, that, in order to our Salvation, it will be necessary, that we be entitled to a Perfect Obedience; then this may instruct us, not to trust in them *alone* for our Salvation. For, tho' it be true, that we cannot be saved *without* them; yet it is as true, that we cannot be saved by them *alone*; because an Imperfect Cause can never produce a Perfect Effect. Such Salvation then, as the Gospel has taught us to hope and expect, *God*

N

in

in our Saviour only can *bestow*; but we can never by our Good Works *deserve*. And therefore, even he, who has wrought out such Salvation for us, has taught us (when we have done the best we can) still to confess our selves *unprofitable Servants*.

5. Lastly, If no Man's Obedience be perfect in this World, then it will but ill become us to *boast* of our Perfection *here*: Which in this latter Age has been the known Practice of several proud Seducers, and Enthusiasts; who have therefore despised all other *Christians*, but those of their own Cast or Sect, as carnal and profane Creatures. A Pride hateful to God and Man, and such, which has constantly betrayed it self to come from that proud Spirit, (which is the great Deceiver) by the detected Falsities, Forgeries, and Villanies of its most celebrated Pretenders. Let us therefore have a care, that we be sober, and humble: Let us not be *high-minded*, but *fear*: And seeing *there remaineth a Rest for the People of God*, let us labour to enter into that Rest, lest any of us fall short, by reason, not only of our *Unbelief*, but of our *Confidence* also.

C H A P. IX.

Whose that Perfect Obedience is, in Consideration of which, Eternal Happiness is given to Man. That it is our Saviour's. Some Objections answered; and the Doctrine of the Imputation asserted, 1. Against those, who acknowledge the Expiation; 2. Against those, who deny it. This Doctrine agreeable to the Scriptures.

HAVING laid it down in the former Chapter, that those who shall be rewarded with *Eternal Happiness*, shall be entitled to a *Perfect Obedience*, in order to such their Reward: Our next Business is to enquire, *Whose that Perfect Obedience is*, to which they shall be so entitled; and whether they can *obtain* such Title according to the Rules of Reason, and the Laws of Justice.

1. And to satisfy this Enquiry, we lay it down, first, That as the *Obedience* of our Saviour to the Law, while he was in the Flesh, (and so under the Law) does alone in Justice *deserve* that *Eternal Happiness*, which is promised in the Gospel; so the *Imputation* of such his Righteousness to Believers, is the only *true* and *just* Reason, why they shall be made Partakers of such *Eternal Happiness*. When the Apostle tells us, in the Fourth to

N 2

the

the *Galatians*, the Fourth and Fifth Verses, That *God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law*; he seems to insinuate at least, that our Saviour's being under the Law, was in such Saviour a requisite Condition in order to his working out of Man's Salvation. Now, had our Saviour been *such* a Man as *other* Men are, the Reward (it is confessed) had only concerned his *own* Obedience: But, because by taking upon him the *Nature* of Man, he obliged himself to obey that Law, which God had given to *Man*; and because he *took* upon himself the Nature of Man, when he might *have refused* so to do; and lastly, because he took it upon himself for *Man's* sake alone, and not for his *own*; therefore for *Man's* sake alone, and not for his *own*, he put himself under an Obligation of *obeying* the Law. From all which, the least that can be inferred is, that Man was to reap *some* considerable *Benefit* and *Advantage* from such *his* Obedience.

It is usually alledged in this Place, That had he not obeyed the Law himself, he could not have been qualified to make an Expiation by his Death for the Transgression of others: And we may take notice, that they who offer this Allegation, do in effect tell us, that his perfect Obedience to the Law, was nothing more, in order to Man's Salvation, than a previous Condition

tion to fit and capacitate him to make such Expiation,

2. And therefore we offer it to Consideration, in the second place, That the Reward promised *in a Saviour* to those, who do confessedly pay but an *imperfect* Obedience to the Law, is *greater* than that Reward which was promised to *Adam's perfect* Obedience, *without* a Saviour. It is true, there is not in the Law given to *Adam* any express Promise at all: But then it is as true, that there is an implied Promise. For, when the Law does *threaten* his *Transgression* with *Death*, it does as good as *promise Life* to his *Obedience*. And indeed, there was no *Occasion*, much less any *Necessity*, that the Promise of the Reward (which was Life) should be express; because the Law being given to Man in his Innocence, (that is, while he was in *actual Possession* of the Reward) he was by the Tenor of the Law secure of such Possession, if he did not forfeit it by his *Transgression*.

Now we therefore say, that the Reward promised *in a Saviour* to those, who do confessedly pay but an *imperfect* Obedience to the Law, is *greater* than that Reward which was promised to *Adam's perfect Innocence*; because we are assured by the Gospel, that *Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, nor can it enter into the Heart of Man to conceive, the Reward which God has prepared for those, who in a Saviour shall be saved.* But we are sure,

that no such Things can be truly said of the Reward promised to Man in his *Innocence*: For, he knew his Reward experimentally, and therefore it could not be to him Inconceivable.

Put we the Question then, How comes the Reward promised in the *New Covenant*, so far to differ from, and to exceed the Reward promised in the *Old*? For, no doubt, there is therefore a good Reason for such Difference, because all God's Words and Actions proceed (if I may be allowed so to speak) from *Essential Reason*: And it is as certain, that they all proceed from *Justice*. Now, neither Justice nor Reason do tell us, that an *Immense* and *Inconceivable* Reward can be assigned to a *broken* and *imperfect* Obedience; and, in the mean while, a *less* Reward be assigned to a *perfect* Obedience. Since therefore a less Reward was proposed to *Adam's* Obedience, (had such his Obedience been *perfect*) than what in a Saviour is proposed to a *Christians imperfect* Obedience; it is notorious, that such different Rewards can neither in Justice nor Reason be assigned to the different Obediences, as *such*; but that the Reward to the *Christian* must derive from his *Saviour's* Merits, as the Reward of *Adam* must have derived from his *own*. If therefore it be demanded, upon what Grounds the *Christian's* Reward does derive from his Saviour; the only Answer that can be given, is,

is, That it must derive either from his Saviour's *Sufferings* in his stead, or from his Saviour's *Obedience* in his stead. And then, because we have already made it out, that it cannot either in Justice or Reason, or indeed in Common Sense, derive from his Saviour's *Sufferings* (which do and can, and that too in Nature, only relate to his *Punishment*, but not at all to his *Reward*) therefore we do at last conclude, that that immense Reward which the Gospel assigns to the believing *Christian*, it does assign to him only in Consideration of his Saviour's *Obedience*.

Before we go any farther, we may from what has been said, observe, That the immense Value of our Saviour's *Person* and *Dignity* does shew forth it self, as well in the immense Value of his *Obedience*, as in the immense Value of his *Death* and *Sufferings*. For, as it is evident, that the Reward of his *Obedience* is inconceivably greater than the Reward of *Adam's* had been, (had *Adam* been obedient) so, for the same Reason, it is infinitely greater than the *Obedience* of any other Man, were that other only such a Man as *Adam* was. The *Dignity* therefore of the second *Adam* is inconceivably greater, than the *Dignity* of the first.

Now, as by what has been said, it has appeared, that the *Obedience* of our Saviour is the only *Obedience*, that is or can be entitled to a Gospel-Reward; so, in what is to

follow, we must make it our Business to shew, first, that *Christian* Believers *may* in Reason and Justice be *entitled* to such his Obedience, (which is to be made good by *Reason*;) and, in the next place, that they shall *actually be* so, (which is to be made good by *Scripture*.) And then, if upon the whole Matter it shall appear, that they *may* be so entitled, and that in order to their Salvation, it is *necessary* that they *be* so; then the Conclusion will be, That the *Doctrine* of the Imputation is therefore *true*, because the *Salvation* of Believers is *certain*. But then I would have it remarked, that I only say, that this Conclusion will follow, if our Reasons prove good. For, because the *Salvation* of *Believers* is generally agreed to be *express* Revelation; but the *Imputation* in order to such Salvation, is *not*; therefore, as our Reasons, and those Interpretations of the Scriptures which we bring to back them, may be found defective; so, when once they appear so to be, I do profess in this Case, as in all others, that I shall willingly part with them; because to me, express, and on all Sides acknowledged Revelations, do weigh a great deal more, than all Reasonings, and elaborate Deductions, or Interpretations whatsoever.

Now, to make it out, That our Saviour's Obedience may be justly and reasonably imputed, or assigned over to Believers, in order to their obtaining the Reward

ward of such Obedience, I would take notice in the

1. First place, That it is a Thing in a manner generally agreed among Mankind, that *one* Man's Duty (in many Cases at least) may be done by *another*, and yet the *Reward* of such Duty shall be thought, and that too justly, to belong, not so much to *him* who *did* the Duty, as to *him* for whom it was *done*. The Thing is notorious in all Proxies, Deputations, and Substitutions whatsoever: And every Proctor, Attorney, Solicitor, Factor, Journey-man, Apprentice, and Servant, is a Witness and Proof of it. For, all such Persons do, as such, act, not for *themselves*, but for *others*; and the Benefits and Advantages which arise from such their Actions, do accrue to *others*; and, which is more, and more to our purpose, are by the Common Sense of Mankind thought to do so *justly*. And tho' it be confessed, that in *most*, if not *all* the Cases mentioned, some Benefit does come to *him*, who actually *does* the Duty; yet it is known also, that such Benefit becomes his Due, only by a *collateral* Contract; but that it is neither the *full*, nor the *direct* Reward of the Duty done by him. For, the whole Right of such Reward is universally thought to belong to his Principal. And I do hardly believe, that any Man, tho' never so just and righteous, does then think that he wrongs his Journey-man, when he
pays

pays him his Wages agreed between them, tho' by so doing he does not allow him all that Profit, which he himself reaps by his Work. But if any Man, the better to maintain his Argument, shall resolve with himself to go against the ordinary Sense of Mankind in the Case, and shall pertinaciously affirm, that such Dealing is unjust (as I am satisfied, that in some special Cases some Men are so resolved) I shall not at present (because I need not) contend the Point with them; but shall add in the

2. Second place, that which serves as well for our present Design, but what is more free from all Exception; and that is, That if any *Friend*, purely of his Good-will, without any Expectation of Recompence or Reward, nay, with a fixed Resolution not to receive any; I say, if such a Friend shall undertake and discharge the Duty of *another*; whether his so doing may not so far be imputed to such other, as to entitle him to that Reward, which belongs to such Duty. To say, [*It cannot*] would go a great way towards the making of all Friendship useless, and would have a great tendency towards the rendring of all Peoples Lives forlorn and comfortless; and, when thoroughly examined, would be found to contain so much Uncharitableness in it, that (were there nothing else in the Case) yet such an Opinion, purely upon the account of its Malignity, and

and ill-natur'd Influence upon Humane Affairs, may very well be thought not to contain that Justice in it, to which it pretends. And therefore, because a mutual and friendly *Assistance* of each other, in the Discharge of the several Duties that lie upon us; and sometimes in the *undertaking* and *performing* each others Duties *entirely*, is very beneficial to Mankind in general; and because *Justice* is so too; therefore we shall rather conclude, that it is *agreeable* to Justice, than that it *contradicts* it, that *one* Man may, not only *receive*, but also have a *Right* to the Reward of that Duty, which yet is *done* for him by *another*. To which we shall add,

3. In the third place, That when *one* Man is *disabled* from doing his Duty, and *another*, in Compassion to his Disability, *does it for* him; there it will be so far from being unjust, that the disabled Person should receive the Reward of the Duty so done, that it would be uncharitable (and all Uncharitableness is at least a Degree of Injustice) to debar him of such Reward.

Now before we proceed any further, we do, in order to our main Design, from the Propositions already laid down and confirmed, conclude in the first place, That our Saviour being *made of a Woman, made under the Law*, that is, being Incarnate, and made Man, in order to qualifie himself, among other Things, to fulfil the Directions of the

Law

Law given to Man, might justly (if he so designed and pleased) do that Duty for other Men, which the Law laid upon them as their Duty; and by doing such Duty in their stead, might *entitle* them to that *Reward*, which the Law had promised to those, who should obey it. For, the *Reward*, by the Tenor of the Law, becoming his *Right*, upon the Account of his Obedience, there can (I think) no doubt be made, but that he may, and that justly too, *assign* over such his Right to whom he pleases; and that he may so much the rather do so, because those, to whom he makes such Assignment, were utterly *disabled*, and that too without their own Personal Fault, to do such Duty themselves. And there can be the less doubt, that he might so do, because, had it not been for Man's Disability, and for Man's sake, there had been no Occasion, and much less any Necessity, that he should have been Incarnate, and so have been made Man himself; that is, (so far as we are concerned at present) there had been neither Occasion nor Necessity that he should have brought himself under any *Obligation* of *obeying* the Law given to Man.

Now, if we add, to what has been spoken, that our Saviour will *only* assign over the Reward of his Obedience to *those*, who tho' they neither *did* nor *could* obey the Law, yet however were *willing*, and did testify the Sincerity of their Willingness by their hearty

Endea-

Endeavours to have obeyed it; and who moreover were heartily *grieved* and *troubled*, that they could *not* make good their Endeavours, (which yet is really the Case between our Saviour, and all those, who shall be rewarded for his Righteousness:) I say, if we add *this* Consideration to all the *former*, it may perhaps help to give us a more rational Satisfaction in the Case, and may convince us, that his Assignment of the Reward of his own Obedience, to such People, is an Act of *Justice*, as well as *Pity*; because God, by *putting* his Creatures into *Being*, has (and with all Reverence I desire to speak it) *instated* them in a *Right* to such Things, *without* which they must needs be *miserable*, and which (tho' they heartily endeavour it) yet they cannot by their *own* utmost Powers *supply* themselves with.

From the Whole, we may rest satisfied, that the making over of that Happiness, which was the Reward of our Saviour's Obedience, to other Men, is no such absurd or unjust Thing, as it is but too generally taken to be. And I am pretty well assured, that some even of those Men, who have *stiffly opposed* it in the Case of Man's *Salvation* by our Saviour, yet both *have* and *will allow* it in *other* Cases, that run *parallel* with it; and that therefore, in order to their taxing such a Way of Proceeding of Injustice, they do even contradict themselves.

It

It may perhaps be objected, That our Saviour, by *assigning* the Reward of his Obedience to any *others*, does by so doing *dispossess himself* of such Reward; because, by making it *over to them*, he does in effect make it *away from himself*.

Which seeming Difficulty (for so I shall only call it in this Place) may be easily removed, if we do reflect back upon what has been said in this *Chapter*, concerning the *Inconceivable Value* of the *Purchase* made by our Saviour's Obedience, and the *Inconceivable Dignity* of his *Person*: And, when we have made such Reflection, shall go on farther to compare it with what has been spoken to, and made good, concerning the *extensive Merit* of his Expiation, in the beginning of the Sixth, and upon the Second Objection of the Seventh Chapters. For, by comparing what has been said in those two Places, with the Case now before us, and by applying the one to the other, it will be no hard matter so to resolve this seeming Difficulty, as that it shall not any longer appear to be any such Thing.

But to return: As it has appeared, that Men may obtain the *Reward* promised by the Law, in *virtue* of their Saviour's Obedience to the Law, whereas yet they have not *obeyed* the Law *themselves*; so, if the Reward due to their Saviour's Obedience, can *therefore* only be justly transferred upon them, be-
cause

cause their Saviour did *obey* the Law in *their* stead : Then the next Conclusion will be,

2. That *his* Obedience to the Law must, in order to their receiving such Reward, be accounted as *theirs* ; that is, in other Words, his Obedience to the Law must be first imputed to them as theirs, before they can have a just Title to that Happiness, which is only the legal and just Reward of his Obedience. For, if one Man performs that, which it was another Man's Duty to do, but yet *does* not do it, or, which is more, *professes* that he does not do it *for* that other ; in such Case, that other can never in Justice either claim or receive the Reward belonging to such Performance ; because that Performance can never be made *his*, till it be made *over* by him, who was the *Author* of it. And, on the other side, it is no easie Matter to conceive, how one Man should *make over* the Reward due by Law to his *own* Obedience, to *another* ; if such his *Obedience*, to which alone such Reward is by the Law inseparably annexed, be not some way or other made over also ; And if such Obedience, in such a Case, must some way or other be made over ; the least that can be supposed, will be, that it must be made over by *Imputation*. For, the *Merit* of the Reward consisting in the *Goodness* or *Holiness* (which you will) of the Obedience ; and the just *Gift* of the Reward (according to the Law) depending upon the
Merit

Merit of that Reward; it is obvious to infer, that the *Reward* can only there be justly *given*, where the *Merit* is *lodged*; and that the *Merit* is only lodged *there*, where the *Holiness* or *Goodness* of the Obedience is lodged: For, the Promise of the Reward is only made to the Obedience. If therefore *Eternal Happiness* (the Reward of Obedience to the Law) may be justly transferr'd to any Man, in Consideration of his Saviour's Obedience; it will follow, that the *Merit* of such Reward must (at least Imputatively) be transferr'd also: And if the *Merit* of the Reward be transferr'd, then *that*, in which that *Merit* does alone consist (and that is the Obedience) must be transferred likewise.

And, upon the whole Matter, we do conclude, that that *Part* of the Gospel-Salvation, which consists in *Eternal Happiness*, (which is the Reward of the Saviour's Obedience alone, in rigour of Law) may by that Saviour be justly *assigned* over to Man, which was the *First* Thing which we undertook to make good: And, *secondly*, That to make good the Justice of such Assignment, that *Obedience*, to which alone such Reward does in Law belong, must (at least imputatively) be *assigned* over also.

It may be objected here, That I talk of the *Law*, when I should talk of the *Gospel*. For, tho' it be true, that the Reward promised by the *Law* to Obedience does only *be-*
long,

long, and therefore can in Justice be only *bestowed* upon a perfect Obedience; yet it is not true, that the Reward promised by the Gospel is so clogged or limited, but that by the Tenor of such Gospel it may belong to an Obedience that is not *perfect*, provided such Obedience be attended with Sincerity, and followed with Repentance.

Now, in answer to this Objection, it is freely granted,

1. That the Promise of the Reward in the Gospel-Covenant is, as it is said to be; that is, it stands engaged to Sincerity and Repentance; and that therefore those Believers that are *sincere* in their Obedience, and *penitent* for their Failings, (tho' neither their Obedience, nor their Repentance be absolutely perfect) yet shall inherit such Promise.

2. But then, in the second place, it must be also acknowledged, that God has made and established that Promise of the New-Covenant in our Saviour, and in our Saviour *alone*. Now, the Business of our present Enquiry is not, what is the Promise of the Gospel, (for in that we are agreed;) but upon what *just* and *rational Consideration* such Promise is *founded*. And since it is agreed in general, that it is founded in our Saviour; all the Debate at present is, Whether the Promise of the Gospel-Reward be founded in that Saviour's Obedience, or in his *Death*; or, in other Words, Whether the Promise of the

O

Reward

Reward be not so grounded upon our Saviour's *Obedience*, as the Promise of *Pardon* is upon his Expiatory *Sacrifice*. And if those Reasons which we have already, or shall hereafter offer, do prove, that in Justice and Reason it is so; then the Objection vanishes.

I may add, That the Objection only speaks to the Matter of *Fact*, that there is a Promise made in the Gospel to an Imperfect Obedience, which no one, so far as I know, denies;) But it does not speak, as to the Matter of *Right* and *Justice*, how such a Promise can be justly and reasonably made, without any Violence offered to the Law of *Works*, which is God's Law, as well as the *Gospel* is so: And we may be sure, that God's Laws do not either contradict each other, or controul any the Laws or Rules of true Justice or Reason.

That then, which is the only Thing which is at present maintained, is, That the *Promise* of the Reward in the Gospel to an Imperfect Obedience had never been made to Man at all, because it could not have been made justly, if the *Law* of Works given to Man had never been fulfilled by Man; and that the Gospel-Promise was granted in Consideration that our Saviour fulfilled that Law. And to this, the Objection, so called, is really no Objection at all.

It is confessed indeed, that the Eternal Life promised to Believers in the *Gospel*, will be attended with an Happiness inconceivably
greater

greater, than the Eternal Life promised in the Law to Adam; and it may be thereupon surmised, that the Reward promised in the Gospel has no Eye to the Obedience required in the Law; and (if it has not) that then the Eternal Happiness of Believers cannot be the Purchase of our Saviour's Obedience to the Law.

To which I shall say no more at present, than this; viz. That it is agreed, that our Saviour by his Death took away Death, the Curse of the Law, and made good such his Atchievement by a Resurrection. Now, the Life after the Resurrection is a Life in a *Spiritual* Body, not in a *Natural*, (I speak the Apostle's Words :) And our Natural Reason tells us, that a Life in a Spiritual Body, is a more refined and exalted Life, than a Life in a Natural Body; and that in multitudes of Circumstances it must needs differ from it; perhaps in so many, that it may be as inconceivable to us now, as the future Happiness of the Saints. And yet this refined and exalted Life is no good Argument, that it was not purchased by our Saviour's *Death*; nor, that such his Death had no Eye to the Law of *Works* in such Purchase.

And so say we: Tho' the Happiness of the Blessed be greater, vastly greater, than what was by the Law of Works promised to Adam upon his Obedience; yet that can never make it out, that such Happiness is not the

Purchase of our Saviour's Obedience, or that such his Obedience was not an Obedience to the Law of *Works*. It may indeed convince us of the super-eminent Dignity of his Person, and of the inconceivable Value of that Reward, which by being purchased by him, derives such its Value from such his Dignity, as we observed before; and which is directly to our present purpose, it may furthermore convince us, that the Reward of Believers is the Reward of their *Saviour's* Obedience made over to them; but not a Reward that does or can belong to their own (at the very best) *Imperfect* Righteousness.

I know very well, that this Doctrine is denied by many Divines, and other Learned Men; and those too, not only such, who do utterly *deny*, that God bestows Salvation upon Men in consideration of their Saviour's Merit and Purchase; but even by the generality of those, who yet do *ascribe* the Salvation of Man to such Purchase and Merits. What Reasons they offer for such their Denial, we shall speak to hereafter: But, in the mean time, we shall go on to make good the Imputation, against each Party that denies it; and after that, shall shew, that the Reasons of such their Denial have not that weight which they seem to have.

I. And first, we shall speak to them, who do not barely *acknowledge*, but even *contend*, that the Salvation of Man is obtained in
Con-

Consideration of the Merits, that is, in Consideration of the Death of our Saviour.

And the Men of whom we now speak, do maintain, That in order to Man's Redemption, our Saviour died for Man's Sin; and that, by such his Death, he purchased for Man a Freedom from that Vengeance, which is the just Wages of such Sin. Now, what they so maintain, we believe to be true, and are ready to join Hands with them to make it good, against all the Adversaries of the Cross of Christ. So far therefore we are agreed. But then, it may be demanded, How our Saviour can possibly suffer for *Man's Sin*, if the Sin of Man be not *imputed* to him? For, in order to his suffering for Man's Sin, he must take upon him such Sin; and the taking upon him Man's Sin, is the having Man's Sin accounted as his own; that is, in effect, and in other Words, the having Man's Sin imputed to him. And then, on the other Side, how can Man have any Pretence of *Benefit* from his Saviour's Sufferings, if the Merit of such Sufferings be not *imputed* to Man? For, without such Imputation, the Merit (be it what it will) can only belong to the Saviour himself.

It is evident therefore, by what has been said in short, but might be made out in more Words) that they who assert the Expiation of Sin by our Saviour's suffering in Man's stead, do therefore entitle Man to the Bene-

fit of such Expiation, because Man's *Sin* was *imputed* to his Saviour, and the *Merit* of his Saviour's Sufferings, at least, *imputed* to Man.

Things therefore standing thus in the Case of the Expiation, it may be reasonably and further demanded, Why our Saviour's *Righteousness* or *Obedience* may not as warrantably be imputed to Man, as Man's *Sin* may be imputed to his Saviour? or, Why the *Eternal Happiness*, which is assigned as the Reward of Obedience by the Law, may not be bestowed upon Man in Consideration, that the Merit of his Saviour's *Obedience* is imputed to Man; as well as a *Release* from Punishment may be granted to Man in Consideration that the Merits of his Saviour's Punishment are imputed to Man? For, there is the very self-same Reason, why the *Obedience* of our Saviour should be imputed to Man, in order to Man's *Salvation*, that there is, that the *Sin* of Man should be imputed to our Saviour, in order to such Saviour's *Condemnation*: And there is the self-same Reason, why the Merit of our Saviour's *Obedience* should be imputed to Man, in order to Man's obtaining *Eternal Life*; as there is, that the Merits of our Saviour's *Sufferings* should be imputed to Man, in order to Man's *Release* from Death. That is, Imputation is as reasonable and as justifiable in *one Case*, as in the *other*; for they both stand upon one and the

the same Foot ; and for that Reason, he who throws down one, throws down both. And therefore, whoever rejects the Doctrine of the Imputation of our Saviour's *Righteousness* to Man, does, by so doing, reject the Imputation of Man's *Sin* to our Saviour, and all the Consequences of it : Or, in other Words, he who rejects the Doctrine of the *Imputation*, does, by so doing, reject the Doctrine of the *Expiation* likewise.

2. Those Men who do so far maintain Man's Salvation to depend upon the Merits of our Saviour's Death alone, as to deny Imputed Righteousness to have any thing to do in the Purchase of Salvation, do not seem to me sufficiently to consider, that there are Two Things contained in the Death of our Saviour ; 1. The *Death* it self ; and, 2. His *Obedience* to the Will of his Father, in submitting himself to such a Death. Now, because Death is, properly speaking, what he underwent for the Expiation of Man's Sin, (for the Vindictive Part of the Law does expressly assign Death as the Punishment of Sin) hence it is (as I conceive) that most of those who have discoursed of Man's Redemption for the Sake and Merit of our Saviour's Death, have placed the Merit of the Purchase only in such *Death* ; and in the mean time have wholly laid aside all Consideration of the Merit of that *Obedience*, which attended it. But because the Scriptures in the Case

Speak otherwise, and because we must needs be best instructed out of them, in any thing which concerns our Saviour ; therefore, laying aside at present all Schemes of Humane Reasoning or Contrivance, we shall entirely apply our selves to them for such Instruction. Take we notice therefore, that they inform us, that our Saviour was *delivered to death by the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God* : So St. Peter tells us, in the Second of Acts, and Twenty third Verse ; and so we are told in other Places. From which we infer, that the *Sufferings and Death* of our Saviour was an Act of *Obedience* to the Will and Counsel of God. All which St. Paul gives us in a few Words, but those very full to our present Purpose, when he tells us, in the Second to the *Philippians*, the Eighth Verse, that *Jesus Christ being found in fashion as a Man, humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross*. Since therefore our Saviour's Death was, at least, one Branch of his *Obedience* to the Will of his Father ; that is, since his *Obedience* in the Scripture-Account was shewed in his *Death*, as well as in his *Life* ; and therefore Both, when in Conjunction, were one and the *self-same* thing : I would desire to know, upon what Ground, or by what Warrant, it can be *imagined*, and much less *defended*, that Man is saved for the sake of his *Death*, but that he is not saved for the sake of his *Obedience*.

dience. And I would so much the rather insist upon this Inquiry, because tho' it should be granted, that our Saviour's Death was meritorious of Man's Everlasting Happiness, (and that is the present Case) then, if we must make an Opposition between his Death and his Obedience, (and to ascribe Man's Happiness to his *Death*, but not to his *Obedience*, does make such an Opposition;) but, I say, if there must be an Opposition made between them, it seems much more agreeable to Reason, nay indeed to common Sense, to ascribe such Merit to the *Obedience* of his Death, than to his *Death*. For, it is the Voice of Natural Justice, that *Duty* and *Obedience* may deserve a *Reward*; but it is a Strain beyond Conceit, that *Punishment* should do so too: For, if that were allowed, then the *suffering* of Punishment for the *Breach* of the Law, might be justly meritorious of a *Reward*, as well as *Obedience* to the *Command* of the Law; and so at long run it would come to the same Event to break the Law, as to keep it. But, because that cannot be allowed, therefore, if People will have an Opposition in the Case, where the Scripture has made none, we should rather ascribe Man's Eternal Happiness to the *Obedience* of our Saviour's Death, than to the *Death* it self. And then, if our Eternal Happiness may be ascribed to the Merit of our Saviour's Obedience in *one* Case, why may it not be

be so in *more* ? For, for the same Reason that a Believer may be interested in the Obedience of his *Death*, he may be interested in the Obedience of his *Life* too. Since then, in the present Case, it is allowed, that a Believer has his Interest by Imputation in the *first* Case ; it will follow, that he *may*, and (considering what has already been said) that he *must* have it so in the *last*. That is, in a few Words, That the Obedience of our Saviour both in his *Life*, and in his *Death*, must purchase for Man that Happiness, which by the Tenor of Justice is the proper and appropriated Reward of *Obedience*.

It being evident then, that for the same Reason, for which the Merits of our Saviour's *Death* may belong to Believers, the Merits of his *Obedience* may do so too ; and that both the one and the other do therefore belong to them, because they are *imputed* to them : Our next Business must be with those Men, who *deny* all Imputation whatsoever, and therefore neither allow the Merits of his Life or Death to have any thing to do in the Purchase of Man's Salvation.

And because we have already and largely discoursed of the Purchase made by his *Death* : Our only Business at present will be to enquire concerning the Purchase made by his *Obedience*. And because the Men, we have now to do with, do deny all Imputation of what our Saviour did or suffered what-

whatsoever ; therefore we shall lay down, and attempt the Proof of this following Proposition : *That that Righteousness, by which Believers shall be judged, and in consideration of which they shall obtain Salvation at the Resurrection, and the Great Day, shall be the Obedience of their Saviour, while he lived in the Flesh, imputed to such Believers.*

1. In order to this, we take notice, in the first place, That the Scriptures do tell us, That all Men shall be judged according to their Works, that is, according to their Obedience, or Disobedience in this Life.

2. We lay it down, in the second place, That all those who shall be adjudged to enjoy an Eternal Happiness, must, in order to that blessed Sentence, be first entitled to a perfect Righteousness. This, we reckon, is proved before.

3. We take notice, in the third place, That no Man, tho' never so righteous, yet ever *did*, *does*, or *shall* arrive at a perfect Righteousness in this Life.

The Question then, that remains to be resolved, is, *How* any Man shall come to be entitled to a perfect Righteousness, that so he may be entitled to Eternal Happiness ? And because no Man can warrantably say, how he shall *not* be, unless he do assign some Way how he *shall* be so entitled ; therefore they who in this Case deny all Imputation whatsoever, do tell us, that a perfect Holiness

ness shall be bestowed by God upon Believers by *Infusion*; that is, (for so they must mean) God shall by his Mercy and Free-Grace bestow such a Stock of Holiness upon Believers, as shall cleanse and fill all their Capacities, and so make them perfectly holy, and by consequence capable of Eternal Happiness.

1. Now tho' it be freely, granted, that God will in the next World bestow such an holy, God-like, and eternally-durable Frame of Spirit, upon all those who shall be saved, (as we shall discourse more fully hereafter) yet it is not in Consideration of *such* Holiness, that Believers do obtain that Eternal Happiness, which is the *promised* Reward of the Gospel. For, by what is to follow, it will, we presume, appear, that Salvation obtained in Consideration of our Saviour's Obedience *imputed*, is, *First*, Better accommodated to the Rules of *Reason*, and the Laws of *Justice*, than Salvation obtained in Consideration of an Holiness *infused* after a Resurrection: And, *Secondly*, That as it is better accommodated to the Rules of *Reason*, and to the Laws of *Justice*; so, that it is so also to that Account which the *Scripture* gives us of this Matter.

1. For, the Obedience by which Believers are to be judged at the last Day, is that Obedience which was required of them in *this* World: And accordingly as Men have behaved themselves *here*, so they shall receive the
Reward

Reward of such their Behaviour *there*. So St. Paul, in the Second to the Corinthians, chap. 5. ver. 10. *We shall all appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the Things done in his Body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* By which we may understand, that the Distributions to be made by Justice upon a *Resurrection* have an Eye to the Lives of Men *before* their Death: And from thence we may infer, that they are not to be guided by an infused Holiness, which does (even by those who plead for it) not take place, till *after* the Resurrection. (For, it is agreed on all Hands, that no Man's Holiness is perfect in this Life.) Now, it does not look altogether so rational, nor so agreeable to the Measures of Justice, or the Revelations of Scripture, that a Man should be *judged* according to what he has done in the Body *before* his Death; and yet, that he shall by the last Judicial Sentence be everlastingly *rewarded* for an Holiness infused by God *after* his *Resurrection*. And therefore, if we will adhere to Reason, Justice, and Revelation, we must conclude, that Believers do not *after* this Life obtain an everlasting Happiness in consideration of such an infused Holiness.

2. And, secondly, we may do well to take notice, that the Obedience of our Saviour to the Law, was the Obedience which was required of Man, and which was also paid by

by Man in *this* Life; and that because such his Obedience was perfect, therefore the Reward assigned by the Law to Obedience, was in strictness of Law and Justice due to *such* his Obedience. If therefore his Obedience, while he was in the *Flesh*, may by any Means be so made over to Believers, as to be justly accounted theirs; then there can be no doubt, but that their Right to the Reward appointed to such Obedience will be just and good too. And that it may be justly accounted theirs, we have, as we believe, made it good already. But an Holiness *infused* by God *after a Resurrection*, can in no Sense, nor in any Congruity be *accounted*, and much less can it *be*, an Obedience paid by Man (while in the *Body*) to the Law; and therefore it cannot in any Sense, or in any Congruity, be such an Holiness, to which the Reward, allotted only to Obedience, can belong. And therefore, neither can Eternal Happiness be bestowed upon Believers, in consideration of such an infused Holiness. In one Word, Infused Holiness in order to Man's Salvation, does in no wise agree to that Account which the Scriptures give us of the Last Judgment; and tho' it pretends to *magnifie* God's *Mercy*, yet it takes no care in the mean while to *assert* and *vindicate* his *Justice*; but makes the whole Process of that great Assize to be arbitrary and illegal, whilst it opens a Way to Man's Happiness, by an Holiness,

Holiness, which has nothing to do with the Cause, upon which alone his Trial depends. For, a Reward *conferr'd* in another World, upon an Holiness *infused* in another World, does in no wise look back to, or pass a Judgment upon the Life that was *led* in this World. But because we know assuredly, and that by many express Testimonies of Scripture, that that will be the Work of the Last Day; therefore, for that Reason alone, if yet there were no other, we cannot ascribe a future Happiness, the happy, just, and final Sentence of that Day, to such an infused Holiness. No! the Holiness, for which we are to be rewarded in a *future* Life, must be an Obedience practised in *this* Life. The Duty is laid upon Man by the Law *here*; and the Reward stands engaged to the Performance of such Duty. And if the Righteousness of Man at the Resurrection be not an Obedience paid to the Law *then*, when the Law *required* such Obedience; the Reward promised by the Law can in no wise belong to *such* Righteousness. And therefore, to fantasie a Reward for an Holiness, in which the Law is not at all concerned, (as it is not in an infused Holiness) is to have no regard to the Law at all. For, Happiness bestowed in consideration of an infused Holiness, may as well be granted *without* the Law, as *with* it; nay, indeed much *better*: Because, had there been no Law at all, then such a Management had

not

not affronted the Law : Whereas the Law having been once settled, to bestow the Reward promised by the Law upon an Holiness, which has no Eye to the Law, (as an infused Holiness has not) is to slight and overlook the Law ; for it allows the Law to have nothing to do in the Allotment of such a Reward.

It may be plausibly objected in this Place, That while I vindicate the Cause which I undertake, against one Adversary, I give it up to another : Because, while I assert, That every Man shall at the last Day be judged according to his Behaviour in *this* World, I do in effect refer the Reward, that shall then be adjudged to Believers, to such *their* Behaviour ; that is, in the present Case, to *their Obedience* in this World : And that, because I do so, I therefore pull down with one Hand that which before I had set up with another, *viz.* the Imputation of their Saviour's Righteousness, in order to their Salvation.

1. But this Objection is grounded upon a Mistake ; which Mistake is, that the Objection supposes an Opposition between the imperfect Obedience of Believers, and the Imputation of their Saviour's Righteousness ; from which supposed Opposition, it infers, That if Salvation *be* bestowed upon them in consideration of the *one*, that it *cannot* for that Reason be bestowed in consideration of the *other*. And indeed, such a Supposition

sition being granted, the Inference would be good.

2. But then, secondly, we do assert and maintain, That there is no such Opposition between the Imputation, and the imperfect Obedience of Believers, as that Salvation must be disjunctively bestowed in consideration of the one, in opposition to, and exclusive of the other. For, tho' we allow a Believer's imperfect Obedience to be a *subordinate*; yet we do not allow it to be the *meritorious* Cause of Man's Salvation; that is, tho' he shall have the Benefit of the *Imputation*, in consideration of his *sincere*, but *imperfect* Obedience; yet he shall only obtain his *Salvation* in consideration of such *Imputation*. For, *Justice* only bestows the Reward there, where it is *deserved*; and to bestow it elsewhere, may be called Mercy, or may be called Favour; but cannot, either in propriety of Speech or Truth, be called Justice. Since therefore it is our present Business, to maintain that Method, in which God bestows not only Pardon of Sin, but over and above an eternal Happiness, to be just; and since, in order to its being so, it must conform to his Law, which is so; or else the Law cannot be fulfilled; and since, lastly, the Law does not assign its Reward to an imperfect Obedience; (For, it requires a perfect, not an imperfect Obedience; and its Reward can and does only belong to what

it requires, not to what it does not require.) Since, I say, the Case stands thus; it is obvious to observe, *First*, That because the Reward is only bestowed upon the Saviour's, that is, upon a perfect Obedience, to which alone by the Law it does belong; that therefore the Execution of the Law, in the Distribution of its Reward, is just: And, *Secondly*, That because (as we have already proved) such his perfect Obedience is justly imputed to Believers, in consideration of their sincere, tho' imperfect Obedience; that therefore, as by *his* Obedience alone they are entitled to the *Reward*, so, according to the Tenor of the Gospel, by their *own* Obedience they are entitled to *His*. When therefore Believers come to be judged in *another* World, according to what *they* have done in *this*, the Enquiry shall not be, Whether by their *Life led* in *this* World, they have deserved an *eternal* Happiness in *that*? (for that needs no Enquiry, because it is most certain in it self, and confessed on all Sides, that they have not :) But their Trial shall be, Whether their Obedience in this Life, tho' imperfect, (and therefore in it self undeserving of eternal Happiness) be such, as may so far entitle them to their Saviour's Purchase, as that his Obedience may be imputed to them, in order to their obtaining such Purchase.

I have therefore pursued this Thing the farther, because the *Socinians* do, as much as
in

in them lies, vilifie the *Imputation* of our Saviour's Righteousness; for by that Means they gain great Advantages, to run down the Doctrine of the Expiation. And yet too many of our own People do here close with them; and do not, to me, seem to discern the mischievous Consequences that will fall upon the whole Doctrine of Redemption, if once our Saviour's Obedience be excluded from being the meritorious Cause of Man's Salvation. For, as to my self, I am at present very well satisfied, that if the Law had never been fulfilled by Obedience, the Breach of it had never been expiated by any Punishment inflicted for such Breach whatsoever. For, God's Design in promulging his Law was, that it should be *obeyed*. For, most certain it is, that it cannot be indifferent to him, whether we *obey* what the Law commands, or suffer what it *threatens*. No! his Design is, that we should be holy, and safe: Such a Design flows from his Nature, and is an Effect of his essential Bounty and Goodness, and therefore came from him freely, without the Invitation or Sollicitation of any Thing besides his own Propension or Inclination. But Judgment, that is, Punishment for the Breach of his Law, is his *strange Work*, that is, it does not come from him, as his Goodness and Bounty does, freely and spontaneously; but is extorted from him by the Interposition and Provocation of Sin. To ac-

complish therefore the principal and more natural Design of his Law, it is *necessary*, that his Law should be *obeyed*; for there is no *other* way of *fulfilling* of it. And therefore He who told us, that *not one jot or Tittle of it should fail*; told us likewise, that *he came to fulfil it*: Fulfil it, not only as the *Antitype* of it, but likewise as a *Subject* to it. The Law then was fulfilled by our Saviour's Obedience; and by his Obedience alone: For all the rest of Mankind broke it. And had he not fulfilled it by obeying it, the Vengeance of it had always continued: For, it must have continued, so long as it was justly due; and it must be justly due, so long as the Law remains broken, and not obeyed. We owe our *Reward* therefore to our Saviour's *Obedience*, as we do our *Redemption* to his *Death*. Nay, which is more, and more direct to our Text, because the Law must of *necessity* be obeyed, and because He *alone* did obey it; therefore, for that Reason, as well as for several others, *there is not Salvation in any other*. I would desire them, whom it chiefly concerns, seriously to consider it.

And now having seen what Reason says to the Doctrine of our Saviour's Imputed Righteousness; the next Thing to be enquired, because the next Thing proposed, will be to see, what the Scriptures say to it. In order to which, take we notice in the

1. First place, That our Saviour, at his Incarnation, did take upon him the same Flesh and Blood with us Men. For, because he, the Man *Christ Jesus*, and we, do both of us derive from one and the same single and common Stock, *Adam*; and because we are several Propagations and Branches from that one Stock; therefore we may be truly reckoned, because in reality so we are, the several and distinct Parcels of that common Flesh and Blood, out of which all Mankind are made. But tho' the Son of God became *Man*, in order to be the *Saviour* of Man; and tho' he was made of the same *Blood* with all Men, in order to his becoming *Man*; yet because we know, that the distinct Parcels of this common Flesh and Blood have, and that justly too, very different and sometimes contrary Allotments of Justice; therefore we take notice,

2. In the second place, That all those, who, according to his Gospel, are sincere and penitent, are secure of having the Communications of his Spirit. And then, tho' that Flesh and Blood, of which they with him are made Partakers, be *common* to all Mankind besides; yet by such *Communications* it is so far *particularized*, (if I may so speak) as that in the estimation of the Gospel, those who enjoy such Communications do become a Part of *himself*. And hence it is, that such People are in the Scripture said to be *Members*

bers of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones; and that he is so often, in the same Scriptures, called *their Head*. And we may know, that he himself does so account them, because he reckons those Kindnesses, which are done to his distressed People, as done unto himself. These Things then being so, how does the Scripture teach us to reason upon them in relation to our present Business? Why, as Sin was the Transgression of *Adam* entailed upon all his *Posterity*, because the Covenant was made with *him*, and with all his *Seed*; for, *all Mankind* (as the Apostle in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* speaks in the like Case) *were in the Loins of Adam in the Day of his Transgression*: So Believers, in consideration of their Saviour, being regenerated by the Spirit, and so becoming the Children of God; the *Righteousness* of such their Saviour does so belong to *them*, who are his *Seed*, [See *Isaiah* 53. ver. 10.] as *Adam's Sin* did to *his*. And therefore, in him they are the Sons of God, and the Heirs of the Covenant of Grace. And to this very purpose, and in this very manner too, (if I be not very much mistaken) the Apostle argues, in the Fifth to the *Romans* and the Nineteenth Verse: *For, as by one Mans Disobedience many were made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous*. And we may safely pronounce it, that the Parallel of the Apostle would be no Parallel at all, if the

the *Obedience* of *Christ* did not so affect Men in reference to their *Righteousness*, as the *Disobedience* of *Adam* did to their *Corruption*. And therefore, the same Apostle tells us, in the First to the *Corinthians*, chap. I. ver. 30. That *Christ* is made to us *Wisdom*, and *Righteousness*, and *Sanctification*, and *Redemption*. And the same Apostle still, after he had renounced his *own* *Righteousness*, as well knowing, that it would not avail him for the Purchase of *that Happiness* which the *Gospel* promised, does confide only in *that Righteousness*, which is *through Faith in Christ*, in the Third to the *Philippians*, ver. 9. And in another Place, we are said to be *made the Righteousness of God* in him; and, in the Prophet *Jeremiah*, he is twice called *the Lord our Righteousness*. Other Places might be produced, which, tho' they have been interpreted to a different Sense; yet, by that Light which has been already offered, it does appear, that they do more than barely countenance what we now maintain, viz. That our Saviour's Obedience shall be made ours; and how it shall be made so. For, what we have said concerning that Intimate Relation between him and his People, will be a sufficient Warrant for the Imputation of his Righteousness to them.

C H A P. X.

Some Objections answered, and some Practical Inferences made.

NOW besides those Objections, which lay directly in our Way; and which we were therefore constrained to speak to, in order to clear and open our Passage in the Prosecution of the present Argument; there are some others, which lie against our whole Discourse, and which, because we have promised so to do, we must now speak to apart, and by themselves.

I. And first, it is objected against the Imputation of our Saviour's Righteousness, That such his Righteousness, which is meant in the present Case, is his Obedience to the Law, and that his Obedience to the Law does consist in the Conformity of his Actions to the Law. His Obedience therefore being lodged in his Actions, unless his Actions can be made ours, it is impossible, that his Obedience should be so. For, so long as the Actions of one Man are not the Actions of any other Man; so long it must and will be true, that the Obedience, which is only paid by such Actions, and which is therefore undoubtedly lodged in such Actions, cannot be that others neither. This is the Substance of
the

the Objection, which might be put in more Words ; but because I think the full Force of it is sufficiently expressed in what we have spoken, therefore it needs not.

I. Now, in order to clear this matter, we observe, first, That the Right which *one* Person has in a Thing, may be made over, or transferred to *another* Person, by the *delivery* of such Thing to him ; provided, that he who delivers it, do some way or other signify, that it is his *Mind*, by such his Delivery, to *transfer* such his Right : Where we must take notice of Two Things ; *First*, That bare Delivery of the Thing, without such Signification, does not alter the Right in such Thing : For, in such Case, the *Thing* being only transfer'd *naturally*, but not *legally*, the *Right* in it is not transferred with it. Take the Thing in an Instance. A Man puts a Purse of Money into another Man's Hand, who stands by him, to hold it. In this Case, the Purse and Money is *actually* and *naturally* transferr'd from one Man to another ; but tho' it be naturally transferr'd, yet it is not (for all that) *legally* transferr'd : For, the Alteration of the *Possession*, does not in the Case alter the *Right* ; and so, tho the *Money* be removed from one Man to another, yet the *Propriety* in the Money is *not*. On the other Side, one Man by Deed of Gift, or some other legal and sufficient Conveyance, makes *over* his *Right* in the Purse of Money
to

to another, but still *keeps* the Money in his own *Possession*: In such a Case, tho' the Money be not *naturally*, or *locally*, (call it which you please) transferr'd or made over to that other, yet it is *legally* so. For, tho' the *Possession* remain in the *Donor*; yet the *Right* is transferr'd to, and therefore is in the *Donee*. The *second* Thing to be observed in this Case, is, that that Thing, whose Right is transferr'd by Delivery, must be something which is capable (as our Law speaks) of Manual Occupation. For, tho' the Right to some Things may be transferr'd by Delivery; yet the Right to others cannot be so transferr'd.

2. Secondly, therefore, The Right in a Thing may be transferr'd from one Person to another by *Deed*, or any proper and legal *Instrument* of Conveyance *there*, where the Nature of the Thing is such, that the *Thing* it self cannot be transferr'd by *Delivery*. And such a Thing (for Instance) is a Privilege: For, we may bestow upon another a Privilege, which of Right belongs to our selves, and, by so doing, may give him a Right in such Privilege; tho' we cannot so put him in the possession of it, as we can do of a Ring, or a Garment. Such a Thing then may be *legally* and *rightfully* transferr'd to another, tho' (because it is not capable of Manual Occupation) it cannot be transferr'd *locally* or *naturally*.

3. Thirdly,

3. Thirdly, Where a Thing not capable of Manual Occupation does so inseparably by Law belong to one, that it cannot but do so, without Breach of the Law; yet even such a Thing shall by Act of Law be so imputed to another, that that other shall receive the Benefits, or suffer the Mischiefs, which legally flow from such Thing, as if the Thing it self, which was the Cause of such Benefits or Mischiefs, had been his own. And such are the Actions of some Persons, when they stand in some sorts of Relations to other Persons. And, to come up a little closer to our present Design; it is a known Practice in our own Law, the Law of *England*, that in *some*, if not *many* Cases, the Actions of the Wife shall be so reckoned the Actions of the Husband; and, in some Cases, the Actions of the Husband shall be so reckoned the Actions of the Wife, that they shall, and that too by Law, receive the Advantages, and suffer the Disadvantages, of each others Actions. And I do the rather instance in this Case, (tho' several others might be offered) because we know, that the Scriptures do expressly tell us, that the Saviour is so the Head of his Body, the Church, as the Husband is the Head of the Wife.

These Things being laid down, in order to make plain what is now to follow,

1. It is to be observed, in the first place, That the whole Transaction of Man's Salvation

tion is managed by way of Covenant ; that is, it is managed in a *judicial* or *legal*, not in a *natural* way. This is as notorious, as it is, that the Transaction is carried on by mutual *Obligations* of the respective Parties engaged, by *Promises*, by *Rewards*, by *Punishments*, and the like. It appears likewise by the Sacraments, which are *legal*, not *natural* Conveyances of those Graces or Blessings, of which they are the Pledges. For, Water in Baptism does not *naturally* wash away Sin ; nor are the Bread and Wine *natural* Seals or Ratification of the Covenant in the Sacrament : They only give us a Title to the Benefits of it, as the Delivery of a Deed, a Turf, or a Wand, do to an Estate : That is, they are only legal Ways of Conveyance, and therefore do loudly proclaim a Covenant.

2. The Transaction of Man's Salvation being managed by way of Covenant, (that is, in a legal or judicial, not in a natural way) tho' it be granted, that the Obedience of one Man cannot *naturally* be made over to another ; yet it will not from thence follow, that it may not therefore be made over *judicially*, or in a *legal* way. Nay ! by what has been said already, it is notorious, that it may be so-made over. And therefore, besides the Instance already offered between an Husband and Wife, (which will in the Scripture-Account as well belong to our Saviour and Believers) it is in some Cases the agreed Sense of

of Mankind, that he who does not hinder the bad Action of another, when it is in his Power, (at least, when it *is* his *Business*, and so *ought* to be his *Care* so to do) by not hindring it, does in Law make such bad Action his own: That is, the Action in Law shall be so imputed to him, as if he himself had done it; and he shall accordingly be obnoxious to the just and legal Consequences of it. And then, if the *ill* Action of one Man may (in a judicial way) be justly imputed to another, and so be rated as that others; then there can be no good Reason, why the *good* Actions of one Man may not be justly so rated and imputed likewise.

All therefore that the Objection offers, is, That one Man's *Action* (be that Action Obedience, or what it will) cannot *naturally* become or be made the Action of any other Man: But that it may not *legally* or *judicially* become so to all Intents and Purposes of Law, whether of Rewards or Punishments, as it does not affirm it, so, should it do so, it may, for the Reasons offered, be truly denied, because in deed and truth it is false.

But we shall have occasion to speak more to this Matter hereafter; and therefore shall not pursue it any further here. Only one Remark I would leave upon it, and that is this: That it is too frequent a Practice, when Men discourse upon Points of Christian Doctrine, to treat of such Points rather as Natural

tural *Philosophers*, than as *Lawyers*, or *Divines*: That is, that I may speak my Meaning as plain as I can, they fall upon the *Nature* of the Things, of which they discourse; and so argue from their *Natural* Properties, Qualities, and Powers; and from thence draw such Conclusions, which (tho' they call them Theological) yet have nothing to do with Divinity, or indeed with the Christian Religion. Whereas they should treat of those Things, which are concerned in *Religion*, in a *legal* and *judicial* way: They should examine, what Relation and Regard they have to that Holy Covenant; how far they agree with, or differ from the Design and Purport of it; and, by consequence, what Share they have, or what Influence they *may* or *may not* have, for the hindring or promoting, or accomplishing its Designs. The Case under our present Consideration will make my Meaning still plainer: For, they who tell us, that our Saviour's Obedience cannot be made over to Man, because it consists in Action, and because one Man's Action cannot, in the Nature of the Thing, be made over to another; do only discourse of his Obedience in a *natural* Sense, that is, as *Natural-Philosophers*; but do not discourse of it in a *moral* or *judicial* Sense, that is, as *Divines*, or *Lawyers*: And because they do not, therefore they start from the Business of *Religion*; and so instead of discoursing of the *Christian Covenant*, they
give

give us a Lecture concerning the Nature and Properties of *Animal* Motions and *Powers*: And, in the mean time, overlook that that is, or, at least, should be their Business, which is, the legal or judicial Consideration of such Obedience; as, what Relation it has to the Law; what Influence it has by Law upon the Person whose Obedience it is, or upon others; how far the Merit and Desert of it may go, and the like. And, to come close to the Business we have been all this while upon, Because Imputation is an Act of *Law*, and not of *Nature*, to undertake to overthrow the Possibility of it by the Laws and Rules of *natural* Motions or Actions, is much the same thing, as to attempt to open a difficult Place of Scripture with a Knife, or a Saw: The Things are of different Natures; and there is no Congruity in the Application of the one, for the Resolution of the other. And I am very well satisfied, that the Church of *Christ* had never been troubled with the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, if the *Romish* Priests had never heard of nor read either *Aristotle*, or his Commentators, concerning *Substance* and *Accident*. It was the jumbling of his Natural Philosophy, and Religion together, that produced the Monster. Nay, which is yet something more; had they been trained up in any other sort of Natural Philosophy, they had been very well satisfied and contented without that new and uncouth

uncouth Article of their Christian Faith. Other Instances might be produced to shew, that gross Fooleries and Corruptions have crept into Religion at this Door. Whereas a due Consideration, that the Christian Religion is a Covenant, and the treating of it as such, would acquaint us much better with the Nature, and engage us more effectually to the Duties of it. But this useful Remark being left in this place, we proceed.

2. The second Objection therefore against the Imputation of our Saviour's Obedience to Believers, in order to their obtaining the promised Reward of the Covenant, stands thus: That supposing, that our Saviour did provide for the *Directive* Part of the Law by his *Obedience*; and that he did also fulfil the *Vindictive* Part by his *Death*: In such Case, there does therefore seem to be a *Superfluity* in his Provision; because, should his *Obedience* alone be imputed to us, we should by that Means be entitled to a perfect *Righteousness*; and then there had been no need of his Death to expiate our Sins, because then we should have had no Sins to be expiated. And that which may add some Strength to what is thus alledged, is this: That our Saviour paying that Obedience to the Law, while he was in the *Flesh*; the *Obedience* so paid was *paid before* his Death; and therefore, in the Course of Things, it should seem, that it might be *imputed before* his Death,

and,

and, in the Course of *Justice*, *without* it. For, when by such Imputation we were once entitled to his Righteousness, the Plea of his Death, in order to qualify us for Happiness, must needs be useless and superfluous.

Now, tho' it may seem indeed, that Things might *have* gone so, if we only have a Regard to the Order of Time; yet if we look to the Order of Reason and Justice, we shall easily perceive, that they could *not*. For, we cannot by any Estimation of Justice whatsoever be reckoned Righteous, so long as our Guilt lies upon us; and, when once by our Sins we have made our selves guilty, such Guilt must needs lie upon us, till it be one way or other expiated. Now, because we have already and fully made it out, that it neither is, nor can be expiated any other way, than by the Death of our Saviour; therefore the Death of such Saviour must, in the Order of Justice, *first* expiate such our Guilt, *before* we can possibly be entitled to a perfect Righteousness. For, who can put a clean thing into an unclean? It is neither agreeable to the Methods of Wisdom or Justice, so to do: And therefore we may be sure, that it cannot be the Practice of the most Wise and Just God. No! we know well enough, because we are told so by the Spirit of God, that our Saviour *first* died for our Sins, and *after* that rose again for our Justification. And we know moreover, that when

Q

God

God had once given forth his Law, tho' had an exact Obedience been paid to it, the Vengeance of it, which was only Conditionally threatned, had never been executed, (for, the Justice and Execution of such Vengeance does entirely depend upon our Transgression;) yet *after* we had transgressed the Law, the Execution of such Vengeance was as *necessary*, as was the *Happiness* promised, if we had *not* transgressed it. For, Vengeance does, by the Tenor of the Law, stand in the same Relation to Sin, as Happiness does to Obedience. The first becomes our Due, in case we neglect our Duty; the last, in case we perform it. And the Distribution both of the one and the other, must as necessarily follow, upon our Performance or Non-performance of those Conditions to which each of them do stand respectively engaged, as it is necessary for God to love Holiness, and hate Wickedness. One Part of the Law therefore is in Justice to be provided for, as well as the other. And then, if neither the Punishment of Man could fulfil the Law, on the one Hand; nor the imperfect Obedience of Man, on the other; and if our Saviour undertook for Man's sake to supply Man's Defects; then there was the same Necessity in Justice, that he should fulfil the *Vindictive* Part of it, by his *Death*; that there was, that he should fulfil the *Directive* Part of it, by his *Obedience*. And therefore, as neither his Obedience, nor
his

his Death, had been necessary, (no, nor his Incarnation neither, upon which such his Death, and such his Obedience do depend :) But, I say, as neither his Obedience nor his Death had been necessary, if Man had obeyed the Law himself; so, upon Man's Transgression of the Law, they both became necessary: Because, as we have already seen, Man's Punishment is in Justice as necessary upon his Breach of the Law, as his Obedience was upon God's Promulgation of the Law. And therefore, when our Saviour undertook to save sinful Man, that is, Man who had *transgressed* the *Directions* of the Law, and Man who lay *exposed* to the *Vengeance* of the Law; it was necessary, in order to his doing so *justly*, that he should have a Regard to *one* Part of the Law, as well as to the *other*; that is, that he should fulfil the *Vindictive* by his *Death*, and the *Directive* by his *Obedience*. And had he not *done* both, one Part of the Law (at least) had been neglected, and so the Redemption had not been just. By which we may by this time understand, that there is no Superfluity in his providing for Man's Salvation, both by the *Obedience* of his Life, and by the *Sufferings* of his Death. For, that *cannot* in Reason be accounted Superfluous in the doing of any Thing whatsoever, without which such Thing cannot be done *justly*.

Now, as in our Answer to the *former* Objection, we made good not only the *Possibility*, but the *Legality* too of the Imputation of our Saviour's Righteousness ; so, in our Answer to *this*, we have shewed the *conjunct* Necessity both of the Imputation, and of his Death, in order to Man's Salvation. By all which, we may at last come to understand, that God in his Counsel for Man's Salvation, as he consulted his Mercy, so did not lay aside the Care of his Justice. For, the whole Transaction, as we have largely seen, was in *him*, *Justice* ; as it was to *us*, *Mercy* : *Justice*, as it fulfilled the *whole* Law ; *Mercy*, as it redeemed us from the *Curse*, and invested us in the *Promise* of the Law. A strange Mixture ! and (had it not been discovered to us by Revelation) by our Natural Reason not to be fathomed : But, as it is revealed, agreeable, as we have seen, to such Reason so assisted.

1. By which we may, in the first place, understand, That tho' *Christ crucified* be to the Jews a *Stumbling-block*, and to the Greeks *foolishness* ; yet to us he is (and that notoriously) *the Wisdom of God, and the Power of God*. For, his Wisdom and his Power can, we see, bring Things to pass beyond the reach of Angels and Devils, and therefore much more beyond the reach of short-sighted Man : And yet by his Light he *can*, because he *has*, instructed us, that such Things are not

not only the Effects of an Almighty *Power*, but of an Almighty *Wisdom*, of an Almighty *Justice*, and of an Almighty *Mercy* too. For, in the Business of Man's Salvation, as in all Things else, he does so display his Attributes, as that they never clash nor interfere. His Mercy does not fight against his Justice, nor his Justice against his Mercy; and neither fights against his Wisdom. By the Revelation therefore of the Christian Religion God has admitted us to a nearer View of his Dealings with the Children of Men, and has, at least, communicated so much of his Counsel to us, as may assist us (if we be not wanting to our selves) to *provide* for our own everlasting *Happiness* and *Security*; and to *vindicate* and assert his *Justice* and *Mercy*. Let us therefore thankfully receive the Mercy, as it is graciously offered; and not pretend to regulate his Revelations by our feeble Reason; but guide our Reason by his Revelations. For, we know, that he can do more than we can; and therefore also we may know, that he can guide us better, than we can guide our selves. And because he has vouchsafed in Mercy so to do, it will but very ill sort with that Deference we owe him, to do, as too many now-a-days do, that is, to return from *Revealed* to *Natural* Religion, and so to walk in Paths, not only of our own *choosing*; but, many times, of our own *making* too. For, since the *Day-Star* from

on High hath visited us, it is our Duty, as to guide our *Lives*, so to guide our *Faith* by that Light which it affords us.

2. Since we can only be saved in Consideration of our Obedience to the Law, and since none of us have paid such Obedience; and so, if we stand the Award of our own Deserts, we must needs fall short of Salvation: I say, since Things are so, we ought with Heart and Voice to praise our Saviour, who by an Infinite Condescension both obliged himself to obey the Law, and so intimately united us to himself, as to entitle us to his Obedience, by which we may be saved. For, as there is no other way of obtaining Salvation, but by Obedience; so *there is no other Name given but his, whereby we must be saved*; and therefore we may safely conclude, that that Obedience, by which we must be saved, is his. His Love to *Righteousness* then made his Obedience *perfect*; and his Love to *us* made his Obedience *ours*; and Both (if we be not wanting to our selves) will make our Condition happy and secure. And then surely our Security and Happiness, as they do very well deserve, so they do require a Thanksgiving. For, we therefore stand bound to be grateful to, and to love the Author of our Happiness, because we find, that we cannot but love our selves.

3. As we cannot be saved without our Saviour's Righteousness; so, as we desire our
own

own Safety, we should heartily endeavour to *qualifie* our selves to be made Partakers of such his Righteousness. And we may be sure, that our *Desire*, at least, after Righteousness, and our *Good-will* to entertain it, are necessary even for our obtaining the Imputation of it; because it cannot in any Sense be ours, if we be not *willing* that it should be so. We must be therefore *disabled* to receive it, if we be *unwilling* to entertain it. So much Righteousness God requires of us, in order to our being entitled to a perfect Righteousness. I know, that *some* Divines do *speak* of Irresistible Grace, and that *some* do *defend* it: That is, in a few Words, they make God, by the arbitrary Determinations of his own Pleasure, to bestow Grace upon some Men, whether they will or no, and even against their Inclinations. And, to make good what they so maintain, they instance in the Conversion of *St. Paul*, and such like Cases. But tho' *St. Paul*, and some others, have been converted by Miracle; yet we know well enough, that Miracles wrought for the self-same purpose, have not always been attended with Success; and that the Miracles even of our Saviour himself, and those too wrought before their Eyes, did fail of their designed Effect, and that, in a manner, upon the whole Nation of the *Jews*. And we know not the Hearts of Men, nor the *inward*, but *real* Preparations of Soul,

that may duely qualifie them to admit God's Grace. But we do know, that *St. Paul* thought verily, that he ought to do as he did: And then, tho' he was *defective* in his Knowledge, yet because he *acted according* to such Knowledge, he was therefore *honest* and *sincere* in his *Practice*. And then, if God in *pity* to his *Ignorance*, and in *approbation* of his *Sincerity*, did reward that Sincerity with an extraordinary Direction for the *guidance* of his Practice; we may from thence be taught, that his Grace was suited to *St. Paul's* Will. For, he willed that *after* the Miracle, which he willed *before* it; that is, he willed that, which he took to be good. And indeed, we may as well think any *other* Creature to be capable of Righteousness, as we may think *Man* to be so without his *own* Will and Consent. Let us therefore take care, that we *will* and *endeavour* to obey God's Law, that is, to be righteous; if we design, that God our Saviour should *make* us so: For, we cannot *be* like him, unless we are *willing* to be so. He therefore who would appear at the Wedding Supper of the Lamb, must take care to wash and *cleanse himself from all Filthiness of Flesh and Spirit*, in order to his putting on the Wedding-Garment. For, as they only shall be pronounced *Blessed*, who shall be found *Righteous*; so they only shall be found *so*, who do sincerely *desire* and *endeavour* to be so.

CHAP.

C H A P. XI.

The First and General Proposition asserted from all that has been said : That the whole Doctrine of a Gospel-Salvation, as laid down in the Scriptures, is agreeable to the allowed Practices of Mankind in their Legal or Judicial Proceedings ; and is worded in the Scriptures accordingly.

AND now having gone so far, before we proceed any farther, we shall bring all that we have hitherto spoken, to our Design at the Beginning ; and by so doing, shall endeavour to make it out, That *there is not Salvation in any other, but in Jesus Christ alone ; and, That there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved.*

1. And to do this, we shall first shew, That no other, but our Saviour alone, could so suffer for Sin, as to obtain a Release from the Penalty, which the Law had threatned against it : Or, which is much one and the same Thing, That no one, but our Saviour alone, could make an *Expiation* for the Sin of Man.

2. And, secondly, That no one, but our Saviour alone, could, by an exact Obedience to the Law, *purchase* that Reward, the Gift of

of *Eternal Life*, which the Law had promised to such Obedience.

1. Now, in order to our making good our first Proposition, we must examine, what *Qualifications* are absolutely necessary, in order to fit any one to make such Purchase; and then enquire farther, Whether such Qualifications either do or can belong to any *other*, besides our *Saviour* alone.

1. Now the first and leading Qualification in him, who shall be fitted for the Purchase of a Release from the Penalty of the Law, which they have incurred, who transgress the Law, is, that he, who makes such a Purchase, must be one of the *same* Kind with *them* to whom the Law was given; that is, in the present Case, must be a *Man*. For, the Law was given to *Man*, was broke by *Man*; and therefore also the Breach of it, in the Congruity of Things, and by the Laws of Common Sense and Justice, is to be punished in *Man*. Now, tho' our Saviour was not the only Person in the World, who had this Qualification, (for every Man besides is as real a Man, as he was) yet he was the only Man among all Mankind, who by this Qualification was *fitted* for the effectual *enterprising* and bring to *pass* those other Things, which are absolutely necessary for the Purchase of the Release spoken of.

2. For, secondly, The next Qualification of him, who is fitted for the Purchase of a Release

Release from the Penalty of the Law, is, that he must be an *Innocent* Man. He was to be a *Lamb, without Spot or Blemish*, and to answer to the Paschal Lamb, which in *this*, as in several *other* Things, was a Type of that *Lamb of God, which should take away the Sins of the World*. For he, who is qualified to suffer for *others*, in order to release those others from the Penalty of Sin, must not therefore be a Sinner *himself*; because, if he be so, then he must by the Laws of Justice, and even according to the Tenor of that Law, which assigns such Penalty, suffer the Penalty for his *own* Sin: And he, who suffers the Penalty of the Law for his *own* Sin, cannot therefore suffer the Penalty of the Law for the Sin of *others*; at least, in the *present* Case he cannot; because the Penalty of the Law, upon the Transgression of it, being the *loss of Life*, his *own* Penalty exhausts the *whole* Stock or *Possibility* of his so suffering: For, he who has but one Life, (and no Man has more) can pay that Life but once: And therefore, if he lays it down for his *own* Sin, he must for that Reason have nothing remaining to lay down for the Sin of *others*.

3. He who is duly qualified to purchase for Mankind a Release from the Penalty of their Sins, must be a Man whose Life is of *more value* than the Lives of all the *rest*. And the Reason for it is plain and obvious, because we know, that the Lives of *all* the rest can

can make *no* such Purchase: And the *Lives* of all the rest cannot therefore make any such Purchase, because the *Death* of no *single* Man can make such a Purchase for *himself*. For, what no *single* Man's *Death* can do for *himself*, that the *Death* of *all* Men cannot do for *all*: For, there is just the same Proportion between *all* Men, and the *Death* of *all*; that there is between *one* Man, and the *Death* of *one*. Besides, supposing a Man to be a Transgressor of the Law; it looks very absurd to affirm, that the *Death* of such a Man, which is the *Punishment* of his Transgression, can be the *Purchase* of his *Release* from such *Punishment*: For then, the self-same Thing (and that is his *Death*) will bear a quite *contrary* Character; for, it will be both the *Wages* of his *Sin*, and the *Purchase* of his *Ransom*; that is, it will be the *Vengeance* of the Law, and the *meritorious Cause* of his Freedom from the same *Vengeance*. Every *Sinner* therefore against the *Law*, must be a *Sufferer* under the *Vengeance* of the Law; and that Law, which *adjudges* those who transgress it, to *Death*, does not, by so doing, design to *return* them to *Life*: For, if it did, then, by *inflicting* its Sentence, it must design to *revoke* that Sentence, and, by making the *Punishment* a *Release* from the *Punishment*, must look like *Trifling*, and not like *Justice*.

The Loss of no *Sinner's* Life then is of Value sufficient to put a Period to the Execution

tion of that Sentence, which the Law pronounces against those who do transgress it : And every Man's Death, in the Course of the Law, had been eternal, were there nothing else to remove it, but his own Strength, that is, in the present Case, but his own Death. For, if the *Death* of a dead Man can do nothing for him, we are sure, that no *other* of his Powers or Merits can : For, in the Case before us, he can have no *other* Merits of his own to restore him to Life, but the Merits of his *Death* ; and the Merits of his *Death*, as we have seen, are *none* at all. And to expect any Relief from a *dead* Man's Powers, is to expect Relief from *no* Powers at all ; for Death crushes all the Powers of all Men whom it seizes.

Now this being the Condition of all Men who die, because they are Sinners, we may from hence safely conclude, That if any Man, who is not a Sinner, shall *undertake* by his own Death to make good the *Ransom* of all the rest from Death, and after that, shall *make good* his *Undertaking* ; I say, if any Man shall do this ; we may be sure, that his Death, or his Life, (which you will) is therefore of more Value than the Life or Death of all the rest, because he does *by it make* that Purchase, which all the rest could *not* do by *theirs*. For, in the present Case, the Value of the Thing may be truly and justly estimated by the Possibility of the Purchase it can make ;
because

because the Possibility of the Purchase depends upon the Allowance of the Great and Just God. And then when God is willing to release Man from Death, in Consideration of the Death of his *Innocent Saviour*; and when he is *not* so, in Consideration of *sinful Man's own Death*; and when he does professedly declare such his Will in many Places of his *Word*, and by the repeated Attestations of Matter of *Fact*, whereby several People have been raised from the Dead, in the Name, and by the professed Power of the Saviour: I say, when we find all these Things to be so, (as we *do*, or at least easily *may* find them so to be) we may from the Whole conclude, That the Death of our Saviour is of more Value, than the Death of all Mankind; because *it can* do that, which the *Death* of all the rest *cannot* do, and that too by the Allowance of God himself.

Now, from these Propositions, so laid down, we may therefore conclude, That *there is not Salvation in any other, but only in our Saviour, set forth in the Gospel.*

1. Because it was absolutely necessary in Justice, that the Law being *broken* by *Man*, the *Punishment* threatned by the Law should be inflicted upon *Man*. For, the *Threatning* of the Law has the same *Eye*, and the same necessary Relation to the *Transgression* of the Law, that the *Reward* has to the *Obedience* of the Law; and either, the same necessary

Relation

Relation to each, that it has to God's Holiness and Justice. And therefore, so *necessary* as it is, that God should be *holy* and *just*; and so necessary as it is, that he should in his *Laws* be *serious* and *true*; so necessary also it is that the *Vengeance* threatned by his Law should *there* take place, where the *Duty* commanded by the Law is *not* observed. Now because no Man, except our Saviour, could so undergo the Vengeance of the Law, as without such Saviour's Help to be ever freed from such Vengeance; therefore we do from hence conclude, in the first place, That *there is not Salvation in any other, but in our Saviour alone*, as Salvation is taken for our Redemption from the Vengeance and Penalty of the Law.

2. Because no Man is qualified to suffer the Penalty of the Law *so*, as by such his Suffering to redeem others, that are Sinners against the Law, from *their* suffering for their Sin, unless he be *Innocent* himself; and because no Man, except our *Saviour*, was ever *Innocent*, that is, no Man, except him alone, did ever fulfil the Law; therefore no Sinner can be saved, as Salvation is taken for a Release from the Vengeance of the Law, but only by the Death of our *Saviour*, that is, by the Death of *him*, who was the only *Innocent* Person of all Mankind.

3. Since the *Death* of all Mankind (because it is the Punishment threatned by the
Law

Law against the Transgressors of it) is not of Value sufficient to *expiate* the Sin of Mankind, whether we consider their Punishment and their Guilt in the *Gross* or *Lump*, or whether we consider it in *Parcels* and *Particulars*; and since Death is the necessary Punishment of the Law; and since, lastly, if there be any Redemption purchased from such Penalty, it must, for the Reasons alleged, be made by a Death of *more* Value than *all* the Deaths of *all* Men: I say, from these Reasons in conjunction, we do conclude, That *such* a Death is necessary for Man's Redemption from the Curse of the Law. And then, *whose* Death that Death was, the Scriptures do sufficiently acquaint us; for, they expressly and frequently tell us, that it was the Death of *him*, whom they set forth to us as our *Saviour*.

And from the Whole, we do infer, in the first place, that no other, but our Saviour alone, could so suffer for Sin, as to obtain a Release from the Penalty which the Law had threatned against it; and that therefore *there is not Salvation in any other*; and, that *there is no other Name given under Heaven among Men, whereby we must be saved*, as Salvation is taken for our *Redemption* from that Vengeance, which the Law threatens and executes upon the Transgressors of it.

2. The second Proposition therefore laid down at the Beginning, comes next in order

to be made good; and that is, That no one, but our Saviour alone, could, by an exact Obedience to the Law, purchase that *Reward*, *Eternal Life*, which the Law has *promised* to such Obedience. And to make this good in a few Words, we take notice, in the first place, That as the Law, by the same Tenor of Justice, does engage the promised *Reward* to the *Obedience*, as it does the threatned *Vengeance* to the *Transgression* of the Law; so we may from thence infer, under this Head, That every Man, who will be *Partaker* of such Reward, must *pay* such Obedience; as we did under the *last*, That every Man, who was *guilty* of such Transgression, must *suffer* such Vengeance. He therefore who does *not* obey the Law, does *lose* his *Reward*, as certainly, as he who *transgresses* it does pull upon himself his own *Punishment*. Now because, among all the Race of Mankind, *no* one, except our Saviour, has *obeyed* the Law; therefore every Man besides him, when left to the Purchase of his own Obedience, has *forfeited* his Reward. No Man therefore does, upon his own Account, deserve such Reward. And then, because we know, that Justice does deal with Men according to their Deserts; therefore, the Reward being *Eternal Life*, or *Happiness*, every Man, when left to himself, has lost such Happiness. That Part therefore of a Gospel-Salvation, which consists in *Eternal Life*, is not to be expected by any Man, but by the Saviour alone.

R

Now,

Now, that our Saviour obtained it for himself, is not questioned. And that it was the Gift of God to others, in Consideration of his Obedience to that Law, to which others, as well as himself, stood obliged, we have already, and at large made good. If therefore all *other* Mens obtaining Eternal Life, does not proceed from their *own* Obedience, but from their *Saviour's*; then we may now begin to perceive, that *there is not Salvation in any other, but in our Saviour alone*; and that too as Salvation is taken in the Gospel for the *Gift of Eternal Life*.

The *Socinians*, we know, who deny the Salvation of Man to be our Saviour's Purchase, do attempt to elude the Force and Evidence of that Text, which is the Subject of our present Discourse, and of several other exprefs Places of Scripture, which assert the same Thing with it, by starting the Question, Whether or no God might not, by some other Means, have saved Mankind, had it pleased him so to do? And by that Means have (as we observed at the Beginning) endeavour'd to alter the Controversie from Matter of *Fact* to Matter of *Possibility*; and to engage others in that sawcy Dispute of what God *can* do, and of what God *cannot* do. Whereas it is sufficient for us to know, what God *has* done; and abundantly sufficient, when he himself does furnish us with such Knowledge by his own exprefs Word. And if what that Word

tells
us

tells us in the Case, be agreeable to our rational Sentiments, to that Light which he has afforded us to judge Things by ; if moreover it be agreeable to the Common Sense, that all Men have of Justice, (and Justice and Reason in this Case are the same;) if that our Light, which confirms to us the Reasonableness and Justice of his Proceedings in the present Case, does by the same Measures guide all Governments, not only *Christian*, but others ; and if it be more than a shrewd Sign, that because *Mankind* do, and that too in their Laws and Judicial Proceedings, treat *one another*, for the most part, as *God* in the present Case does treat *Mankind*, that they are guided so to do by that Light, which he himself has afforded them : I say, if all these Things are so ; then it may, besides all that has hitherto been offered, make out the Conclusion, at least, very plausible ; That his Dealings with Mankind in and through a Saviour, as we have out of the Scriptures laid it down, are just and reasonable. Let us try the Matter in a few Instances, which will direct our Meditations to a great many more, and see whether the Business be so, or no.

The Merits of our Saviour's Death, *we* say, and so do the *Scriptures*, are made over to us. We may add, but we need not, that they are so made over by his last Will and Testament. And, if we do add it, the Scriptures will bear us out in it.

The Merits of his Obedience also are, as we with the Scriptures say, made over to us.

By the first, we obtain Redemption from the Curse of the Law.

By the last, an Inheritance with the Saints in Light.

Now, what says the Light of Nature, when it discovers it self in the Practices of Mankind in the like Cases?

I. Why, in the first place, The Father has served and obliged his Prince by a due Regard to his Laws, and to himself, and by a Defence of both from the disobedient Attempts, and rebellious or hostile Outrages of all others. In such Defence he has been a great Sufferer; has lost his Estate, his Limb, perhaps his Life. The Son of this very Man, guided more by his own *vicious Inclinations*, than by his *Father's Example*, dips his Hand in Treason, and thereby forfeits his Life to the Law, and to his Prince. Suppose we now, that the Prince grants this Son his Life, in Consideration of the Father's Services and Merits, and so cancels the Demerits of the Son, by putting the Deserts of the Father in the Scale against them; which, especially if the Father died in the Prince's Cause, is the ascribing or imputing (which you will) the good Deserts of one Man to another, who is utterly destitute of such Deserts. Now, such a Case as this being supposed; will any Man accuse the Prince of Injustice,

Injustice, for the Grant of such a Pardon? Was not the Injury done to himself? And may he not remit such an Injury, by esteeming the great Services of the Father, and the *Benefits* that *he himself* received, and the *Mischiefs* which the *Father* sustained by such his Services, a sufficient Counterpoise to the Injury of the Son? And may he not be satisfied, that the near Relation and dear Affection of the Father to the Son, may make the *Son's* Pardon a Gratification and Requital to him for all his *own* Services and Sufferings? Surely these Things may be allowed among Men: And I do not at all question, but that these, or such like Things, have been practised in all Governments, and yet that their Justice has not been taxed for such their Practice. And yet I do assert and maintain, That the Pardon of *Man's Sin* in Consideration of his *Saviour's Sufferings*, does much more critically and nicely come up to the Rules of an exact Justice, than the Pardon of the *Rebel* in the present *Instance* does; and I am well enough satisfied, that what has been already offered, will abundantly make good such an Assertion. But savage Man will not allow what his *God* says or does to be true and just; tho' at the same time he will allow and approve the same, or the like Practices, in his *Fellow-Creature*.

2. But to proceed: Secondly, The Father, by his Labour and Toil of his *Body*, or by

that of his *Brains*, purchases to himself an Estate. His Son enjoys his Share in it while the Father lives, and the whole of it after his Death. How comes the Father's Purchase to derive to the Son? You will answer, By the Law. But the Question returns; By what Act does the Law make the *Father's* Purchase to become the *Son's*? Why, it may be replied, that as the Son descended from the Father, so it is but fit that his Estate should do so too. Well! be it so, or any thing else; (for more may be said in the Case.) But still in the Case, the Father's Right being extinct by his Death, moves, that is, is transferr'd upon another: So that he comes rightfully to *possess* the Estate, who yet did not *purchase* it, nor *earn* it, nor perhaps do any *one Act* for the obtaining the Possession of it. Not only the *Estate* then, but the *Right* and *Title* to the Estate, which is undoubtedly lodged in the Purchase, and must be made good by it, is transferr'd from one Man to another, and that too not by or for any *Action of Desert* in the Man who enters; but by an Act of *Law*, call it Imputation, Translation, or what you please. And, which is more, such a Translation both of Estate and Title is accounted just by all Mankind, generally speaking. For, it is not material in the Case, that some arbitrary and despotical Governments do in some few Instances vary from it; because not only the rest of
Mankind,

Mankind, but even they themselves, do, by their *contrary* Practice in *other* and *more* Cases, *condemn* their own Practice in *this*.

Now to our Purpose: Shall the transferring not only of one *Man's Estate* to another, but even of the *Right* and *Title* in that Estate, be thought just between Men among themselves, and that too by that Light of Reason, which is confessedly given them by God? And shall it at the same time be unlawful and unjust for *God* so to make over his Purchase, his Right and Title to any Thing, (as he thinks fit) to Mankind, as one *Man* may do to *another*? Certainly he has as good a Right, and as full Power of disposing of what is his own, as any Man, or any Law of Man whatsoever. And therefore, when he tells us, that he does so in the Case under our present Consideration, it would become us in Modesty, in Reason, and (because the Case does very much import our Welfare) in Interest likewise, to believe his Word, and to approve his Doings: And that too more especially, because in those very Writings, in which the Conveyance is contained, he seems all along to word such his Conveyance in *Law-Terms*; thereby giving us (at least) an Hint, that in the Transaction of Man's Salvation by our Saviour, he did in a great measure condescend to those *Methods* and Ways of *Judicial Proceedings*, that *Men*, by that Light of Reason which they received from

him, had instituted among *themselves*. And therefore, when we had forsaken his *Family*, by revolting from that Duty, which we owed him, as his *Natural Children*; as he calls himself our *Father* in *Christ Jesus*, so he calls us his *Adopted Sons*, upon his *restoring* us to such his *Family*; and in order to the *Renovation* of our *lost Title*, he does esteem us to be *Regenerate*, that so by becoming again the *Children* of God, we may *inherit* the Kingdom of him our *Father*. So he calls us the *Heirs* of Salvation, and makes us a *Title* to the *Purchase* of our Saviour, by calling us his *Brethren*. He reckons us as *Joint-Heirs* with him, and discourses in several Places of our *Inheritance*. Now, when we are assured, by Multitudes of other Places of Scripture, that all these Appellations and Titles are given to us, not only in *Terms* in the like Cases made use of, at that Time, by the most celebrated *Laws*, but also in Consideration of our Saviour's *Purchase*; I say, when we find Things so, and that too in the Book of God, wrote professedly on this Subject; does it become us to think, that the Holy Ghost, the Indicter of these Things, did only word himself at *random*? Or ought we not rather to think, that in so doing he had a *Regard* to those *Legal Ways* of *Conveyances*, which were established by Man's Reason and Sense of Justice in those *Laws*, which were then most current in the World? We cannot, I am sure,

we

we cannot *rationaly* think so. For, why are we told, that we are *bought* with a *Price*? Why are we told, that our Saviour *purchased* us with his Blood? Why are we told, that we are *redeemed*, *not with corruptible Things, as Silver and Gold; but with the precious Blood of Christ*; but that our Redemption and Salvation did, as to the Justice and Equity of it, answer to those *Legal* Ways of transferring of Rights from Man to Man? For, our Redemption was *purchased* by our Saviour, (so it is expressly worded) and by him therefore *conveyed* and *made over* to us, because otherwise it could in no Sense be called *our* Redemption. Indeed, a *Purchase* does, in the very import of the Word, imply the Acquisition of a Thing in a *Legal* way; and by so doing, does, in the Nature of the Thing, imply also a *Legal* Power of *making over* such Thing to *another*. For, he can only *legally* sell, or otherwise give or convey, who has a *Legal* Right in the Thing sold, given, or conveyed. And he can only *legally* purchase, who pays a *Legal* Price. When therefore the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures does so word the Manner of God's bestowing and our receiving Salvation in and by our Saviour, as to do it in such *Terms*, which were at that time *Terms* of the most *celebrated* Law (next to his own) that ever yet was, or perhaps ever will be in the World; and when he does so frequently, and almost

almost constantly ; it would become us to believe and think, that he *designed*, and that too even by his *manner* of expressing the Thing, to insinuate to us, that the Salvation he all along speaks of, was bestowed in a way of *Conveyance* at that time *familiar* among *Mankind* ; in such a way, as was established both by their own *Laws*, and by their own *Practice* ; in such a way, that their best Reason, granted to them by himself, had *set on foot* : And that, upon this Account, his way of doing it so, as is by him expressed, (and that too all along in that very Book, where he affords us the Discoveries of it) is just, equitable, and legal. I do but run over these Things, and in a manner glance at them ; because I rather design to give an Hint to *others* more able so to do, than to pursue them *my self*. For, if a Man well-studied in the Civil Law (a Law that will weigh with Mankind so long as good and sound Reason has a free Passage in the World :) But, I say, would such a Man so thoroughly acquaint himself with the New-Covenant, the Covenant of Grace in *Jesus Christ*, as to be able exactly to compare it with that Law, which is the Business of his Profession ; I do not at all question, but that such a Comparison, judiciously managed, would go a great way in removing those Doubts which have been started by People of all Parties, concerning Man's Redemption.

And

And because several Learned Men, I know, are very well versed in *both* those Laws; I do the rather hope, that God will put it into the Heart of some of them, to bless the World with such a Christian and beneficial Piece of Learning. But this by the by. In the mean time, from what has been said in short, we may learn thus much; That the *Salvation* of *Man* is the *Purchase* of the *Son* of God; that the Benefit (at least) of such Purchase is by the Purchaser *made over* to Man; that in Consideration of that Intimate Union that is between him and Man, by his taking upon him the same Flesh and Blood with Man, and by affording to Man the Communications of his Spirit, a Way is opened, as for the more congruous and equitable Way of such *Conveyance*, on the *one* Side; so, on the *other* Side, for the more congruous and equitable Way of Man's *entring* upon the Possession of such Purchase; and that when the whole Thing is strictly sifted and examined, it will be found to be agreeable to the just and equitable *Rules of Law*, as well as to the express and plain *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. But I desist: Only I would offer an Inference or two, that may relate to our Practice, before I do so.

I. And first, If God spared not his *own Son*, when he had put himself into the *Place* of Sinners; we may from thence conclude, that neither will he spare *us*, when we our selves
are

are Sinners, and that too by our *own* default. For, besides that he was, and was so proclaimed by God himself, *his only Son, in whom he was well pleased*; I say, besides that; the Generosity, Charity, and Candor of such an Undertaking as our Saviour's was, (by which he shewed more Tenderneſs to others, than to himself) may be thought to be a very considerable Motive even to Justice it self, so far as is possible, to remit to him a great deal of that Rigour, and Severity, which Sin does deserve. And then, if notwithstanding such his Undertaking, yet he was fain to pay the *uttermoſt Farthing*, that is, to die; how can we hope to escape, if we the Original, and therefore also the Principal Sinners, come under the Severity of so exact a Justice? We may be sure, that the Portion of Vengeance allotted to *us* in such a Case, will not be less severe. For, if God so treated his *Beloved*, because *interposing* Son; how do we think he will treat *avowed* and *professed* Rebels? Or, as our Saviour himself speaks in the like Case, *If these things are done in the green Tree, what shall be done in the dry?*

2. And as this Consideration may serve us for *Caution*; so the next, that is, the second, may serve us for *Consolation*: And I shall give it in the Words of the Apostle, in the Eighth to the *Romans*, ver. 32. *He, that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely*
give

give us all Things? For, his delivering up his Son for our sakes to become *Man*, to lead an hard and uncomfortable *Life*, and to die a miserable and scandalous *Death*, that both by his *Life* and *Death* he might work out our Salvation, is such an exalted Evidence of God's Love to us, that Imagination it self can hardly conceive, that any thing can extinguish it, but our Ingratitude for it. And our Natural Reason and Common Sense may easily instruct us, that he, whosoever he be, that is ready and willing (and that too even to Performance) to do us the *greatest* Kindness, will not for that very Reason refuse us in a *less*. It concerns us therefore, as we would not *reject* the Kindness *already* offered, and as we would not *exclude* our selves from all *future* Love and Kindness, to make good our Gratitude, by receiving our Saviour, and that Salvation which he brings along with him, with a due Acknowledgment and Respect; and to make good such our Respect, and such our Acknowledgment, by receiving him upon *any*, but more especially upon his *own* Terms. Let us therefore cast away our *Sins*, that we may *receive* him: Let us, by *loving* each other, practice our selves to *love* and *receive* him: Let us receive *him*, by receiving the *Pledges* of his Love, exhibited to us in the Sacrament of his most Blessed Body and Blood: And let us not think, that *Christ* crucified will profit us any thing, if we do *not*

so

so receive him, as he *requires*, and therefore also *so* receive him as we *ought*. For, he does in effect refuse the *Gift*, who refuses the *Instrument* of Conveyance by which such Gift is to be *signed* and *made over* to him. And it is irrational and imprudent, to *expect* the *Love* of him, the *Pledges* of whose Love we do *reject*. Let us cast off therefore every evil Work, every Sin, that does beset us, and *gird up the Loins of our Mind*, (as the Scripture speaks) and do the Work of *Christians* in all Cases whatsoever; that so at last we may receive the blessed Wages of such Work, through *Jesus Christ* our Lord, and only Saviour.

C H A P. XII.

That besides the Saviour's Righteousness imputed, God will after their Resurrection endow Believers with a perfect, inherent, and eternal Holiness. How the Saviour did fit and prepare Men for such an Holiness.

BY what has been hitherto discoursed, we have seen,

1. That God in a Saviour has made Provision for the *Expiation* of Man's Sin, in order to save him from the *Vengeance* of the Law, the just *Wages* of such Sin.

2. We

2. We have seen, that he has not barely provided for Man's *Escape* from the Vengeance of the Law, by the Merits of his Saviour's Death ; but that he has also provided for his positive and future *Happiness*, by the Merit of his Saviour's Obedience.

3. But yet, in what is now to follow, we shall find, that his Mercy has not stopped here ; because, in the third place, he will, in and through our Saviour, endow Man with a *perfect* and *inherent Holiness* : By which I mean, such an holy, Angelical, and withal durable Frame of Spirit, that shall for ever secure him from all possible Sin, and shall for ever engage him in a vigorous and chearful Discharge of all holy Duties ; and in so doing, shall both *accompany* and *secure* his Happiness to all Eternity. For, tho' it be confessed, that Believers do by the Communications and Assistances of the Spirit arrive to a *Degree* of such an Holiness in this Life ; yet it must be confessed also, that it is but an *imperfect* Degree : For, it is not vigorous, nor uniform, nor constant ; but *irresolute* and *weak* ; and therefore has its frequent Intermissions and Failings. But, as we shall see more fully in what is to follow, the Holiness of the Saints in *Glory* is, like their Happiness, *firm*, *lasting*, and *immutable* ; and therefore will be found to be a Gift of God in *Christ*, that does vastly, if not infinitely, exceed the most refined Holiness of the very best Man
in

in this Vale of Sin and Misery. It shall be the Business then of our present Undertaking, to make it good, that besides that Title, which Believers in another World shall have to their *Saviour's* Righteousness, in order to their *future* Happiness, that they *themselves* shall be endowed with a *perfect, inherent, and indefectible* Holiness, in order to the *secure Eternity* of such their Happiness.

Now, to put this Matter into a clear Light, that so we may be the more rationally satisfied in all that is to follow; we lay it down, *First*, That God by his Almighty Power having made the World, and all particular Beings in it, has by virtue of such his Creation an undoubted Right and Title to the Dominion over all Things so by him created: And that therefore all his Creatures ought to be in Subjection to him, and to act according to the Determinations of his Will. And it is hardly to be doubted, but that all those Creatures, which by the Boundaries of their Creation are devoid of Understanding and Free-will, do constantly act (according to those Impresses and Powers that God in their Formation has stamped upon them) in a regular Subordination to such his Will. And the Scriptures do give us, not only frequent Hints, but also express Declarations, that so they do.

Now, as God created those *lower* Creatures, so did he the *higher*, and those which
are

are endowed with more noble Faculties. And because, among such Creatures, upon whom he has bestowed an *Understanding*, to enable them to *know* his *Will*, and with a *Will* to enable them to chuse *Obedience* to such his Will, we are not acquainted with any *other*, but *Angels*, and *Men*; and because our Design is only concerned about *them*, and chiefly about the *latter*; therefore, directly to our present Purpose, we take notice,

That *some* of the *Angels*, *first*; and, by their Instigation, the *first Man*; and (because all Men ever since do derive from him in a Lineal Propagation) therefore also *all* Mankind, by transgressing God's Will made known to them in his Laws, have revolted from their *Allegiance* to him, and have, by so doing, in effect renounced and disclaimed that their *Subjection* to his *Dominion*, which was (if I may so speak) his natural and essential Right. For, Wickedness is a professed and avowed *Renunciation* of that *Subjection* which Rational Creatures owe to their Holy and Rightful *Lord* and *King*, even the God that made them. And, for that Reason, it is an *Encroachment* upon his *Authority*; for it does lessen and contract the Extent of his *Kingdom*. For, because a *Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of his Kingdom*; and because all those Laws, by which its Administration is executed, are in themselves Holy, Just, and Good; it is, upon that Account, very obvious to

S conceive,

conceive, that Wickedness, so far as it goes, does defeat such Administration, and overturn such Laws; and by so doing, does *diminish* the *Authority*, and *encroach* upon the *Jurisdiction* and *Dominion* of the *Rightful* and *Supreme Lord*.

Now, from what has been thus spoken in short, we may easily understand, that the *fallen* Angels having first revolted *themselves*, and by their Sin withdrawn their Allegiance and Subjection to their most Holy and Supreme Lord, did (what other Rebels after their *Example*, and perhaps by their *Instigation*, have done to weak and short-sighted People) by false Colours, and taking Delusions, invite *Mankind* into the same Revolt and Rebellion with themselves; and, by so doing, draw away a Part of God's Kingdom and Dominion; and, in opposition to his Holiness, that is, in opposition to God himself, set up a Kingdom of their *own*, a Kingdom of *Darkness* and *Wickedness*; in plain *English*, a Kingdom made up of such Creatures, who by their Sin and Wickedness did rebel against and revolt from their Holy and Rightful Lord and King. All this, being Matter of Fact, is expressly discovered to us by the Revelations of God: And the History of Man's Fall, recorded in his Word, with the Account that we there meet with of the Devils *Kingdom*, of his *Servants* and *Subjects*, of his *Slaves* and *Captives*, of his *Wars* against the Holy

Holy Angels, the faithful Subjects of the True and Everliving King, do afford us a very lively Description of the Thing. And because no *Christian*, who is but tolerably acquainted with the Revelations of God in his Holy Word, can possibly be a Stranger to it; therefore we have thought it less necessary to quote the several Texts, which by being put regularly together, will give us an exact and Historical Account of it. And indeed, we have so much the less need to do so, because we shall be farther and more fully satisfied in it by those Things which are to follow. Well then! Things standing in this State, God was pleased to send his Son, his Beloved Son, *made of a Woman, made under the Law, made Man*, to be a Saviour, a Redeemer, a Light to Mankind; that is, he sent him in Man's Nature, to *guide* and *direct*, to *save* and *redeem* Man from that Condition, into which he was brought by his Sin and *Rebellion*. What that Saviour did in order to the *obtaining* of such Salvation, we have seen already; and what is to be done in order to the *everlasting* Continuance of such Salvation, is to be enquired now.

As therefore it was *one* Part of God's Counsel in sending his Son to Mankind, to *expiate* their *Sins*; so it was *another*, and indeed the main and grand Design of such his Message, to *rescue* them from their *Slavery* to Sin, and from their *Subjection* to *Satan*; and

so to bring them back to his own *Kingdom*, and to reſettle them under the *Juriſdiction* of his own moſt holy *Dominion*. For, it is a very great Miſtake (which, I am apt to believe, has proceeded chiefly from our overfondneſs of our ſelves) to think, that God's chief Deſign in ſending our Saviour, was to free us from the *Vengeance* due to our Sins; thereby vainly imagining, that God has a greater Concern for our *Impunity*, than he has for our *Holineſs*; and that he had rather we ſhould be *ſafe*, than that we ſhould be *good*. Whereas our Reaſon will tell us, that God muſt needs love Holineſs, as he loves himſelf, becauſe he himſelf is (if I may ſo ſpeak) Eſſential Holineſs: And then the ſame Reaſon will tell us, that he muſt needs love *himſelf* better than he loves our *Safety*; and that more eſpecially, when we our ſelves, by ſlighting and neglecting of Holineſs, had betrayed ſuch our *Safety*. As therefore Man did, by his Compliance with the Devil, that is, by his Sin, *expoſe* himſelf to the Proſecutions of God's *Vengeance*; and as he did, by the ſame Means, ſo far forth *revolt* from his *Dominion*, and *withdraw* himſelf from his *Juriſdiction*, as to become the *Subject* of *Satan*, and *Slave* of *Sin*, (by which Means God was ouſted of his Natural and Original Right to Man's Obedience, and his Subjects ſo far forth drawn off from their Allegiance to him, as to ſlight his Authority, by ſlighting

ing his Laws, and to fight against him, by opposing his Holiness;) so, when the Hostilities were come to this pass, that *Man* did fight against *God* by his *Sins*, and that *God* did fight against *Man* by his *Justice*; tho' *God*, in order to a Reconciliation, sent his Son into the World, and by him a Proclamation of *Pardon* to all who should return to their Duty; yet our *Reason*, nay, our *Common Sense* will tell us, that the *Restoration* of *God's* just Right and Dominion by *Man's Return* to *Holiness* and *Duty*, is in it self a Point of greater moment, than *Man's Pardon*. And therefore, by the Tenor of that very Covenant, in which the Articles of Reconciliation are contained, it is stipulated, that *Man* shall first be obliged to *repent* and *return*, before *God* shall be obliged to *forgive*. And we know, that our Saviour himself, in that Prayer which he taught his Disciples, and in them all *Christians*, does put that Petition, [*Thy Kingdom come,*] before that, by which we pray, that *God* would *forgive our Trespases*. Why, *all the Nations of the Earth* are before him, but as the Drop of the Bucket, or the small Dust of the Balance; And then, can we think, that his *Honour* and *Natural Right* is not to be consulted before *Man's Safety*? It cannot be; and because it cannot, therefore we do conclude, that tho' *God* did design the *Pardon* of *Man's Sin* by a Saviour; yet for all that, the grand and principal De-

sign of sending him, who was to be that Saviour, was the *bringing* Man from a State of Sin to a State of *Holiness*, the *purchasing* to himself a *peculiar People*, *zealous of good Works*; or, as it is in the Fifth to the *Ephe- sians*, ver. 27. a *glorious Church*, *not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any such Thing*; and thereby restoring to God so much of that Part of his *Dominion*, which, by the Temptation of the Devil, and by Man's Revolt, had been *broke off* from his Kingdom, and which was *willing*, upon the Gospel-Conditions, the Proclamation of Pardon, to be *restored* again to it.

Now, from what has been spoken, I would infer, That it is a great Mistake, to make the Sending of our Saviour in its *first*, *principal*, and *grand* Design, to be the *Pardon* of Sin. For, as *Obedience* to the Law is the *first* and *principal* Design of the Law; and as Punishment is but a *secondary* Design of the Law, and is only grounded upon the Defeat of its grand and principal Design: So *Pardon* of Sin, in the very Nature of the Thing it self, depending only upon the *Desert* of Punishment, can therefore rise no higher than its Fountain, and therefore can at the most be but a *secondary* Cause of our Saviour's Coming.

And therefore, should we suppose God to *pardon* Sin, tho' in and through our Saviour, *without* any Regard had to the fulfilling of the

the *Directive*, that is, of the *grand* and *principal* Part of the Law; we should, by that means, suppose him to *break* the *Directive* Part of the Law, in order to his *contradicting* the *Vindictive* Part; that is, we should suppose him to break *both* Parts of the Law, in order to such a *Pardon*. For, Veracity is one Branch of Holiness; and when God tells Man in his Law, that upon his Transgression he should *surely* die, as we may perceive by the *manner* of the Delivery, that the Denunciation is *serious* and *solemn*, not only because it is backed with an *Asseveration*, but because also it is *incorporated* into the Law; so, to tell us, that God may by a *Pardon* (that has *no* Regard to the *Directive* Part of the Law) *revoke* such his solemn Threat and Asseveration, is in effect to say, that he may *start* from his *Veracity*; and that is the same as to say, he may start from his *Holiness*; or, in other Words, that he may *himself* break the *first* and *principal* Part of the Law, by *remitting* the Penalty of the *last* and *less* principal. For, Holiness is so refined a Thing, and so all of a Piece, (if I may so speak) that he who transgresses its Rules in any *one* Case, does, by so doing, forfeit his Title to the *whole*, and therefore is truly called Unholy.

And therefore, I cannot but wonder, that Men, after almost Six thousand Years Experience in the Case, in which, because all Men have been *Sinners*, therefore all Men have

died; I say, I cannot but wonder, that, after so long an Experience to the contrary, any Man should now think, that Men may be freed from the Curse of the Law, before they have fulfilled the Directions of it. For, methinks, by that Experience alone we may be instructed, that Men should never be *blessed* with *Impunity*, till they *first return* to their *Duty*; and that they must *first* be *obedient* to the Law, before they shall be *freed* from the *Vengeance* of it.

But because some Things under this Head may bear a Dispute; and because some others may seem hard to be understood; therefore, to be more plain and open, and to offer something which is so, and which will as well conduce to my main Purpose and Design, I lay it down,

r. First, That as it is asserted in the Gospel, and is generally agreed among all *Christians*, That an Eternal Life and Happiness is contained in that Salvation which the Gospel promises; so is it, That whosoever shall be made Partakers of such Happiness and such Life, must be so perfectly Holy, as to be eternally free from all Sin. For, as *without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord*; so, the Blessed in Glory are by all allowed, as to be eternally without *Misery*, so to be eternally without *Sin*. And we do not question, but that it may be made out, and that too by Force of Reason, without the Assistance of Revelation,

Revelation, that compleat Happiness (and an Happiness that is not eternal, is not compleat) and that too in the Nature of the Thing, is inconsistent with Sin, which does certainly and constantly bring Misery along with it, wheresoever it is permitted to come. And the Reason why I say, I do not question it, is, because what *has* Been done *already*, may be done *again* : And we know very well, that the Thing has been done already, and that too beyond all possible Contradiction. But because it is an allowed Thing, That where the Seat of eternal Happiness is, there nothing can either *enter* or *remain* but pure and unspotted Holiness; therefore we shall spend no Time in the Proof of it; but shall take it for granted, and so proceed to our

2. Second Proposition, which is, That the Holiness of *those*, who shall inherit eternal Life and Happiness, does not come from *themselves*, nor is either the Atchievement or Fruit of their *own* Powers. This we may be sure of, because *a clean Thing cannot come out of an unclean*; and all Men here are unclean, because all Men are Sinners. And since Man in his Innocence did not keep himself Holy, it is unreasonable to expect, that after the Fall, when Mens Abilities are lessened, that any Man should make himself so. And we are moreover assured, that no Man does make himself so, because all Men do die: And we are further assured, that no Man can *carry*
any

any more of his own Holiness with him into *another* World, than what he was *Owner* of in *this*: And lastly, we are infallibly assured, that no Man can secure to himself an Holiness to *Eternity*, which he has *not*. From which Things run over in short, we may be satisfied, that that Holiness, which shall for ever attend those of Mankind, who shall be made Partakers of eternal Happiness, is not their *own*. The Thing might be made out in more Words; but it needs not: And therefore,

3. Since that Holiness, with which Men shall be endowed in Heaven, is not their *own*; it must therefore be bestowed upon them by some *other*: To which we may add, That that other can be no other, but *God*. For, it may be very well presumed, that the very best of Creatures have no Holiness to spare, upon a Supposition, that one Creature could make over any of his own Holiness to another. For, upon such Supposition, whatever they should contribute towards the *perfecting* of *another* Creatures Holiness, would be so much *pared off* from their *own*; and so a *Defect* of their *own* Holiness would be the *Consequence* of that *other's* Perfection; and an *Abatement*, at least, if not the *Loss* of their own *Happiness*, a *Consequence* of such *Defect*. But then it is a vain Thing to conceive, that *one* Creature can make over its own inherent Holiness to *another*; and it is as vain

a Thing to think, that it can bestow on that other an Holiness, which it has not to bestow; and it is certain, that it has no Holiness, but its own. But neither shall I pursue this any farther, because I shall at one View offer a short Prospect of all that has been already laid down, in order to make it good, That our Saviour has made Provision, that Believers shall be endowed with an indefectible Holiness in a future and happy Life.

Take we notice therefore, That as a Gospel-Salvation does imply in it, not only the *Pardon of Sin*, but the *Reward of Righteousness* too; so the Reward of Righteousness (as the Gospel, and as he, who is both the Author of that *Gospel*, and of that *Reward*, does set it forth) is to be eternal and everlasting. Now, tho' it should be granted, that *Heaven and Happiness* is in it self the *just* Reward of *Duty* and *Obedience*; yet it cannot be so freely granted, that an *Eternity* of Happiness is so; unless that *Duty*, or *Obedience*, to which that Happiness is assigned, be *eternal* also. And the Reason why such a Thing cannot be granted, is grounded upon Matter of Fact, and that Matter of Fact authorized by God's own Judicial Proceedings. For, we may safely affirm, that the fallen Angels were once Holy; and we may affirm it so much the more safely, because being in their Nature Creatures capable of so noble a Qualification, there can no doubt be made, but that they

they came forth such out of the Hands of their most Holy Creator. Tho' therefore, while they *remained* Holy, that is, while they did their Duty, we do not question their *Happiness*; yet we do maintain, that that *Happiness* then *ceased*, when their *Holiness* did so: And from thence we do conclude, that their *Happiness* was therefore not eternal, because their *Holiness* was not so. Now because such their *Holiness*, which was not eternal, was their *Original*, or their *Natural*, or their *Personal* *Holiness*, (for you may call it which you please) therefore we do farther conclude, that there is no Security, that any Creatures *Personal* or *Natural* *Holiness* shall be *eternal*.

If therefore we shall bring our present Business to this Case, and by comparing one with the other, take leave to judge of what *may* be, by having seen what *has* been; we may take notice, that if our Saviour did nothing more for Man's Salvation, but only expunge the Guilt of his Sins, and so restore him again to his *Original* Innocence; all this would warrant no more, than that Man should by this Means have been restored to that Innocence, or *Holiness*, of which *Adam* stood possessed before his Transgression. But that this *Holiness* should be *lasting* and *eternal*, we have not all this while any the least Ground of *Warrant*, no nor of *Conjecture*: Nay, we may rather conclude, that it would

not

not be so; because we know, to our Cost, that *Adam's* was not so. For, I would ask, Whether this Innocence, or Holiness, be sufficient to make Man happy? If it be both, answered, and granted, That it is; then I would further demand, Whether it will secure that Happiness to Eternity? If it will, then it must be something more than a Restoration of Man to a State of an *Adamical* Holiness; for we are sure, that that first Holiness could do no such thing: If it will not, then it will not answer to a Gospel-Salvation, because such a Salvation does imply in it everlasting Happiness, and everlasting Happiness must (as we have seen) be attended with everlasting Holiness. In one Word therefore, if, as Man's *Happiness* does depend upon his *Holiness*, so his *everlasting* Happiness must depend upon his *everlasting* Holiness; then we may well reckon, that that Holiness of Man, which shall accompany *eternal* Salvation, must be an *indefectible* Holiness, that shall never fail, and therefore whose Reward shall never cease.

And by this time, we hope, that the Truth of what we have laid down, and of what we designed to make good, may begin to appear; which is,

I. That the Chief Design of our Saviour's coming into the World, was to bring sinful Man to a State of perfect Holiness; for, by that Man's chief Happiness, and (which
is

is yet a great deal more) God's original Dominion and Jurisdiction over Man, is provided for.

2. That an everlasting Holiness is required to an everlasting Happiness.

3. That such an Holiness is none of Man's own, and that therefore,

4. It must come from some other; and that that other must be God.

Having therefore seen, by what has been said, that an everlasting Holiness is necessary, in order to Man's everlasting Salvation, and that such Holiness must come from God: Let us proceed, and by that Light, which his Revelations have afforded us in this Case, enquire, what *Provision* God has made for the furnishing Man with such an Holiness, in order to such his Salvation. And,

1. We are instructed by such Revelations, That God sent his Son, our Saviour, into the World, cloathed with the same Flesh with sinful Man, to instruct and direct him in the Ways of Holiness, by his *Doctrine*, and by his *Example*: That upon this Account he is called *the Light of the World*; for he made our Duty plain and intelligible, took off that Veil from Mens Understandings, by which they were induced to believe, that Holiness did consist in outward Washings, in Ceremonies and Formalities, and such other or Modes or Gestures, which contained nothing of true Holiness in them, because they did
not

not form our Spirits to God's Likeness, nor make us *holy, as he is holy*. And because he found Men laden with Sin, he did advise them to unburden themselves by Repentance, that so they might the more expeditely set about the Attainment of that Holiness, which he recommended to their Practice. And hence it was, that his Fore-runner, *John the Baptist*, first, and *he* himself, and his *Apostles*, afterwards, did all begin their great Work with an Exhortation therefore to *Repent, because the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand*. In a Word, in order to terrifie Men from their wicked Courses, and to invite them into the Paths of true Piety and Godliness, he did by his *Threats* acquaint them with a more *express, grievous, and future Punishment*; and by his *Promises*, with a more *express, happy, and future Reward*, than either Natural Reason or Revelation had as yet discovered. These, with some other, were the Methods which our Saviour, when in the Flesh, took to persuade Men to add their *own* Endeavours to *his*, for their obtaining Salvation. And because these Things were *designed* for such a Purpose by him, and because they have in themselves a natural *tendency* to bring such Design to pass; and because, lastly, the *Salvation* of *Man* does in the whole Oeconomy of it proceed from the *Grace* of *God*; therefore these Things, when summed up together under one Denomination, are called
Means

Means of Grace. These therefore, and the like Means of Grace, and them too backed and confirmed by Miracles, our Saviour made use of, to engage Men to practise and attain that Holiness, by which alone they could in Justice be fitted for Salvation.

2. But then, secondly, we are instructed, both by God's Word, and by our own Experience, That all these Means made use of by our Saviour, did never yet produce *that* Holiness in any Man, which is to *fit* him for his designed *Salvation*. For, what from *Weaknesses* and *Irresolutions* from *within*, and what from *Temptations* from *without*; what from the Temptations of the *Devil*, and what from his *own* wicked, habitual, and overruling Practices, every Man falls short of the Grace of God; and his very best Practices being corrupted with Carelessness, or Inadvertency, or Wilfulness, (and all of them Evil) do not beget in him that Holiness, to which alone eternal Salvation can in Justice belong. It may be then demanded, How any Man comes to be saved? To which I answer in the next, that is, the

3. Third place, That tho' the Means of Grace do not *beget* that Holiness in any Man in this Life, in Consideration of which he can in Justice obtain eternal Salvation; yet we are assured, that the Means of Grace tendered in the Gospel, and made use of by Man, may, and often have this Effect, as to en-

gage

gaze Men heartily to *desire* and *wish* for such an Holiness. This is what our Saviour calls *hungering and thirsting after Righteousness*: An hearty and sincere *Desire* to be what we *ought* to be; and (to make good the Sincerity of such our *Desire*) an hearty and sincere Endeavour to be what we *desire* to be. For, no Man does or can heartily and sincerely *desire* any Thing, who does not also heartily *endeavour* to obtain it. Now, an hearty *Desire*, and an hearty Endeavour after Holiness, does (if I may so speak) open and enlarge the Soul to admit and receive such Holiness, whenever God shall be pleased to bestow it. And because *every good and perfect Gift comes from above, from the Father of Light*, we may be therefore sure, that *Holiness*, the best and most perfect Gift, whereof we are capable, does so too. And we are moreover sure in Reason, that God will more *freely bestow* his best Gift there, where it is most *heartily desired*, and therefore also most *kindly received*: And we are the more sure, that he will do so in the present Case, because the *Will* of Man must in this Case *concur* with the *Grace* of God; or else it is impossible, that the Holiness to be bestowed should ever become his own. For, no Man can in Reason or Nature be holy against his own *Will*. He then, who by the Means of Grace has advanced so far as to hunger and thirst after Righteousness, shall be sure to be filled. We have his

T

Promise

Promise for it, who is *able* to make it *good*; and we have his Promise for it, whose *Promise* cannot *fail*. And then we cannot but be sensible, that he who is *filled* with Righteousness, cannot want that Holiness which accompanies Salvation. And truly, when I consider, how these *lower* good Things, the Blessings of Nature, which are confessedly the Bounties of the God of Nature, do freely flow in upon all his Creatures, where their natural Appetites or Wants do desire or require them, and (where their Powers and Faculties are such) in pursuit of such their Desires, they endeavour to obtain them; it mightily inclines me to think, that his Blessing of *Holiness* will also there flow in, where the *moral* Appetites of his Rational Creatures do sincerely desire it; and where they are so sensible of their Want of it, as to *endeavour* after it.

4. We proceed, and add, in the fourth place, That we are instructed, both by God's Word, and by our own Experience, that tho' a perfect Holiness may be heartily *desired*, and sincerely *endeavoured* after; yet, that it is never attained by any Man in *this* Life; and therefore so neither is a perfect *Happiness*. The Evidence for the *first* is, because all Men in this World are *Sinners*; and the Evidence for the *last* is, because all Men in this World are *Mortal*. Now, as *Sin* is an infallible Confutation of a perfect *Holiness*; so *Mortality*

*tal*ity is an infallible Confutation of a perfect *Happiness*. We are therefore at last arrived thus far, that no Man shall arrive at a perfect Holiness, till he is translated to *another* World : And because it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive, how any Man should arrive at a perfect Holiness in the *Grave*; therefore we may go one Step farther, and add, that no Man shall attain to such an Holiness, till the *Resurrection*: And we may very fairly and rationally *conjecture*, (I may say, *infer*) That then the *Faithful* shall: For, we know, that by the *Resurrection* we shall be released from the *Curse* of the Law on the *one* Hand, and shall enter upon the *Reward* of Obedience and Holiness on the *other*.

5. And then, lastly, Because that Happiness, which our Saviour has purchased for Believers, is an *eternal* Happiness; and because (as we have seen) it is impossible, that there should be any such Thing as an eternal *Happiness*, without an eternal *Holiness*; and because to pretend to bestow an everlasting *Happiness* upon Man, and not an everlasting *Holiness*, without which such an Happiness is *impossible*, is to *mock* Man, and not to *save* him; and because, lastly, We cannot without Blasphemy and Absurdity tax the Counsels and Purposes of our Saviour, in the Business of Man's Salvation, of such gross Prevarication: therefore we do at last conclude,

T 2

That

That *God* in our *Saviour* will endow Believers, at or upon their Resurrection, with an *Inherent, Immutable, and Eternal Holiness*.

Now we have observed before, That the *Punishment* threatned by the Gospel against those, who shall *refuse* their Salvation by the Neglect of the Conditions of the Gospel, is *greater* than what was threatned against the Breach of the Law of *Works*, the Law given to *Adam*.

And that the *Reward* proposed by the Gospel to those, who shall *admit* the Conditions of it, is *greater* than what was by the Law proposed to *Adam* upon his *Obedience*.

And we have observed in this Chapter, That that *Inherent* and *Indefectible* Holiness, which is a Part of such Reward, is greater and nobler than *Adam's* Holiness before the Fall; because it is more lasting than that of him, or indeed of the *fallen Angels*.

Now it is certain, that the Degrees of the *Punishments* are by Justice proportioned to the Degrees of the several Sinners own *Deserts*. And it is certain, that the Rewards of *eternal Life*, and of an *Indefectible Holiness*, do in Justice exceed the Deserts of *all* that are saved, (for they have been all Sinners.) And then, what Grounds these Considerations may afford for the magnifying of God's Grace, and the Merits and Dignity of our Saviour's Purchase and Person, may be a Matter worthy our Meditations. But I shall

shall not pursue it here, because tho' there be an Occasion for me to enlarge what has been said already; yet I am unwilling to repeat.

C H A P. XIII.

By what Means Men shall be put into the Actual Possession of Eternal Life.

HAVING thus far discoursed, First, Concerning the Pardon of Sin; and, Secondly, Concerning the Gift of an Happy and Eternal Life, (the Two Things in which a Gospel Salvation does consist :) And having made it good, That Believers do obtain both the one and the other only in Consideration of our Saviour's Merits; and that their so doing is agreeable to Reason and Justice: Two Things do still remain to be examined.

1. By what *Way* or *Means* they shall be put into the *Possession* of such Eternal Life? And,

2. *Wherein* the *Happiness* of such Life does consist?

1. And in order to the Resolution of the first Thing, we lay it down, as a certain Truth, in the first place, That Man, in order to his *entring* upon the Possession of Eternal Life, must first *rise* from the Dead. For,

all Men die, because all Men are Sinners : And because it is absurd so much as to imagine, that Man can enter upon the *Possession* of *Eternal Life*, while he *remains* under the *Power* of *Death* ; therefore, without any more ado, we shall take it for granted, that Man must be freed from that *Death*, which is *brought* upon him by his *Sin*, before he can obtain that *Eternal Life*, which is *purchased* for him by his *Saviour*.

2. We lay it down, in the second place, as a certain Truth, That because our Saviour underwent *Death himself* for the Expiation of Man's Sin ; and because our Saviour could not in Nature or Possibility be *qualified* to *bestow* upon Man the *Purchase* of such his *Death*, till he himself should *rise* from the Dead : That therefore, in order to Man's entring upon the Possession of an *Eternal Life*, it was necessary, that our Saviour *himself*, as well as Man, should first *rise* from the Dead.

3. We lay it down, in the Third place, That if the Merits of our Saviour's *Death* were of Value *sufficient* to make good the *Expiation* of Man's Sin ; that then, in *Reason* and *Justice*, he ought to *rise* again from the Dead. For, because, in the Case so put, he could have no Concern with *Justice*, but what was his *own* ; and because he himself had paid an *exact* Obedience to the Law ; and because *Life* is the Reward of such Obedience,

dience, as *Death* is the Wages of *Disobedience*; Therefore, if we do allow him to have *unloaded* himself of the Sin of *Man*, which he had taken upon himself, by his *Death*; we must, and do, by so doing, *reinstate* him in his *own Right*; that is, we must allow, that he had a *Right* to be, and therefore in Justice *ought* to be *restored* to Life again. And therefore it is not at all to be questioned, but that our Saviour had never died at *all*, if he had never taken upon himself the Sins of other *Men*. But of this more by and by. In the mean while, these Things being laid down, we proceed, and,

1. Observe in the first place, That our Saviour's Resurrection is almost constantly by the Scriptures of the *New Testament* ascribed to God the *Father*: And Multitudes of Texts might be quoted for it; as, the Second of the *Acts*, ver. 24, & 30. The Fifth Chapter of the same, ver. 26, & 30. The Tenth, ver. 40. The Seventeenth, ver. 31. The Tenth to the *Romans*, ver. 9. The First to the *Corinthians*, chap. 6. ver. 14, &c. We know well enough, that they, who make it their Business to *degrade* our Saviour below his most exalted Dignity and Station, do make use of these Texts for *such* their Purpose: But we know withal, that there are other Texts, tho' indeed not so many; and some of them, when compared with their Context, not so Categorical; which yet

ascribe his Resurrection to *himself*. Such is that in the Second Chapter of St. *John*, v. 19. *Destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up.* And so again, in the Tenth of St. *John*, v. 18. *No Man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* Now, as we made it out just now, that after the Expiation finished he had a Right to *rise* from the Dead; so we do not at all question, but that he had a Power to raise *himself* too. But tho' it should be *allowed*, (as we do not at all question, and that too from several Things already laid down, and made good, but that it may be *proved* :) But, I say, tho' it should be *allowed*, that he had both a *Right* and a *Power* to raise *himself* from the Dead; yet notwithstanding that, it was not altogether so congruous or agreeable to the equitable Proceedings of Justice, that he should *exercise* such his Power, or put *himself* into the possession of such his Right, in the *present* Case. For, because he had *submitted* to offer his Life an Expiatory Sacrifice to the Divine Justice, for the Sin of Man; he had by such his Submission so far *resigned* such his Right and Power into the Hand of *God*, as that, both by the Laws of Reason and Justice, as well as by the Rules of Decency and Congruity, *God* was now become the *sole Judge* of the Validity of such his Sacrifice, for the Accomplishment of the designed Expiation. And if *God* was the
sole

sole Judge of the Validity of his Sacrifice; he had by the same Means the rightful (and I may add, the sole) *Power of declaring* such Validity: And because the *Resurrection* of our Saviour from the Dead, was in effect such a *Declaration*; therefore we may now be satisfied, why the Holy Ghost does so very frequently, and in a manner *constantly*, ascribe the Resurrection of our Saviour in the Scriptures, to God *alone*. To which we may add, That the High-Priest under the Law (who in this very Case was a Type of our Saviour) was obliged *once a Year to enter into the Holy of Holies, but* (as the Author to the Hebrews words it) *not without Blood, which he offered for himself, and for the Errors of the People.* In which Case, it must be confessed, that the *offering* of the Blood to God was in order to his *acceptance*; and that God's *acceptance* of the Blood, that is, of the Life of the Sacrifice, was the *Ratification* of that Expiation, that was made by such Sacrifice. And in deed and truth, our Saviour in the Business now before us, being both the Priest and the Sacrifice to God for the Sins of Man; and his Resurrection being the first Testimony or Declaration of the Acceptance of such his Sacrifice: We cannot in any Congruity suppose, that such Testimony or Declaration should be ascribed to any *other*, but to God alone. And therefore, as all those Texts, which ascribe our Saviour's Resurrection to

God,

God, do in this Case speak *strictly* and *properly*; so we may now, by what has been said, perceive, that they are no *Prejudice* to his *Divinity*; because he having obliged himself to *offer* that Body, to which his Deity was united, a Sacrifice for Sin; he had by the same Act obliged himself to *expect* from God the *Approbation* and *Allowance* of such his Sacrifice; and therefore also to receive from *him* his Resurrection, which was an effectual Declaration of such Allowance: And therefore,

2. I do offer it to Consideration, That the *Resurrection* of our *Saviour* from the Dead, was an undoubted Argument, that he had *finished* and compleated that Expiation, which he had undertaken to make by his Death for the Sins of Men. For, as we are assured by the Scriptures, that he was *crucified, dead, and buried*; and so, that he died the Death of a *Criminal*: So we are assured by the same Scriptures, that he did not die for his *own* Crimes. For, it is utterly impossible, and that too in the Nature of the Thing, that he should *die* for his own Sins, who yet *did no Sin, neither was Guile found in his Mouth*; that is, who had *no* Sins of his own to die for. Now, because we are taught by the Scriptures, and (as we have already made it out) because our Reason, guided by them, does fall in with them, and so both do tell us, that *the Wages of Sin is Death*; that is, that

that there is a Natural Justice in the Case, that Death should be inflicted as the Punishment of Sin : And because we are assured by the same Natural Reason, that it must needs be unjust to inflict the same Punishment upon an Innocent Person, which is the just Punishment of a Criminal : I say, for this Reason, we may be satisfied, that our Saviour, tho' he was in himself a *Lamb without Spot*, yet did die for *some Sins* or others, (be those Sins whose they will at present :) And therefore because the Spirit of God has by his express Word told us, that he died for *our Sins* ; we may, upon his Testimony, rest satisfied, that *so* he did. Thus far therefore we have advanced towards our present Purpose and Argument ; That Death was what the Law threatned for our Sins, and that we being Sinners, and so having incurred the Vengeance threatned, our Saviour (who, as we have shewed, had an absolute and uncontrollable Power to dispose of his own Life, as he himself pleased) did put himself in our stead, became a Sacrifice for us, and so in his own *Person* suffered that Death, which *we* by *our Sins* had deserved. But then, to the making good of our present Proposition, we add, That as he suffered *Death* for the *Expiation* of our Sins ; so if he had not *finished* and *completed* such Expiation, he had not *rose* again. For, so long as the *Guilt remained*, so long the *Punishment* was, and that too

in Justice, to be *continued*. For, in such Case, there had been the same Reason for the *Continuation* of the Punishment, that there was for its first *Infliction*. And therefore, as it was first *inflicted* for a *Guilt*, so it must have been *continued* for the *Continuation* of such *Guilt*. From which we do infer, That if he was justly acquitted from the *Continuation* of the Punishment, then he was also acquitted from the *Guilt*; and if he was justly acquitted from the *Guilt*, that then he had by his Punishment made a *sufficient Expiation* for it. And that he was acquitted from the *Punishment* due to the *Guilt*, and that he was justly acquitted too, the *Resurrection* singly and by it self will make out an undoubted and uncontroulable *Argument*. For, our natural and common Sense does assure us, that a Resurrection to Life is an Acquittance and Discharge from Death: And Reason will tell us, that because a Discharge from Death can only come from *God*, and because *God* cannot but be *just*; therefore that Acquittance and Discharge, that is made by a *Resurrection*, must needs be just too. And therefore, from the Whole we may infer, That the *Resurrection* of our Saviour from that Death, which he suffered as the Punishment of our Sins, was a demonstrative Argument and Proof, that by his Death he had paid a *sufficient Ransom*, and had made a *sufficient Expiation* for such Sins. So that, strictly speaking, in his *Death* consisted

consisted the *Punishment* of our Sins; in the *Infinite Value* of his Death consisted the *Expiation* of our Sins; and in the *Resurrection* appears the full *Proof* and *Evidence* of such his Expiation.

Before we part with this Head, it may not be improper to take notice, that because his Death was of *infinite Value*, that therefore there was a sufficient Ransom paid for our Sins by that Death, so *soon* as it was suffered. For, it must be confessed, that the *Ransom* was then *made*, when the *Debt* was *paid*. And because that is Truth and Justice; we do from thence infer, That our Saviour might, and that justly too, have resumed his Life so soon as he had laid it down. And so he might (for any thing that Justice can offer to the contrary) have descended *alive* from the Cross, after he had once *died* upon it: Nor needed his Resurrection, in point of *Justice*, to have been deferred to the *third* Day, but might (had God so pleased) have been caused on the *first*. But tho' it might *justly* have been done so; yet we do not find, that it was *actually* so done; for the Scriptures tell us, that he did not rise till the third Day. From whence we observe, That as he *died* to save Man from Sin; so he did for some time continue in a State of Death, to *satisfie* and *assure* us, that he did so die. And so as his Death had a regard to God's *Justice*; so his Continuance so long under the Power of Death

Death had a regard to our *Faith*. The *first* was the *Purchase* of our Salvation : The *last* was our *Assurance* of, and therefore also our *Comfort* in such a Purchase. By which we may understand, that his Love was expressed to us even in the Grave ; and tho' (as the *Psalmist* speaks) *no Man remembreth God in the Pit* ; yet we may hence learn, that even in the Pit our *God* both *can*, and *has* remembered *us*.

We may also under this Head take notice, That as our Saviour had *never* died at *all* (as we observed before) because he himself was perfectly *Innocent*, if he had not by his *own Choice* put himself in the stead, and so exposed himself to the Punishment of the *Guilty* ; so we may be confident, that he, whose Innocence was so singular and illustrious, as not to be in the least tarnished, whilst he *inhabited* in mortal Flesh and Blood, must, now that Flesh and Blood is *spiritualized*, (see the First to the *Corinthians*, chap. 15. ver. 44.) be rather the *more* free (if that were possible) from all *possibility* of Stain or Guilt. And we may be secure, that if his glorified Body shall ever live free from *Sin*, it shall for that single Reason, if yet there were no other, live free from *Death* too. So true is that of the Apostle, in the Sixth to the *Romans*, ver. 9, that *Christ being raised from the Dead, dieth no more, Death hath no more Dominion over him* : and that in the *Revelations*, *I am he, that was dead,*

dead, and am alive, and live for evermore. So that the Victory which our Saviour obtained over Death, by his Resurrection, cannot so well be looked upon as a *single Conquest*, since it is to extend it self to all *Successions* of Ages and Time; and is to *last*, when Time shall be *no more*; that is, for *ever and ever*.

3. As our Saviour, by his Resurrection, did so far subdue Death, as to obtain to *himself* a future and secure Immortality; so also he did, by the same Resurrection, so far subdue Death, as to secure a future and glorious Resurrection to all *those*, who are so far *planted into the likeness of his Death*, as to be *dead to Sin*, and *alive to God*. For, if we live to him, while we live here; we may, from his Resurrection, have a comfortable Assurance, that notwithstanding we die for a time, as he did; yet we shall be raised again, and live with him for evermore. To this purpose, we must recollect, that when he died, he did not die for his *own* Sins, but for *ours*. And then, if in his *Death* he laid down his Life in *our* stead; we may be easily satisfied, that it was in *our* stead that he *took it up* again at his *Resurrection*. For, if our Guilt had not been cancelled, and so our Debt discharged, by his Death; then his Death (as we observed under the last Head) had been continued still. And as *then* we did conclude, that he had therefore *satisfied* the Debt, because he

was

was *released* from the Penalty ; so *now* we do conclude, that because the Debt so discharged was *ours*, and not his *own* ; therefore the Benefit of the Release must redound to *us*, as well as to *him*. For, it must needs be unjust in the Creditor to detain us in Prison for that Debt, which our Surety has paid. And because we know, that the Creditor in the present Case is God himself ; and because we know also, that such a Creditor can do no Injustice ; therefore we know, that as when our Saviour *laid down* his Life, he laid it down in *our* stead ; so also, that when he *took* it up again, he took up with it the Lives of all *those*, who by the Conditions of the New Covenant shall have an *Interest* in such his Death. And therefore, as our Christianity does acquaint us, that they who live to *Christ*, do live by the Spirit ; so St. *Paul*, to our present purpose, does tell us, in the Eighth to the *Romans*, ver. 11. that *if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, do dwell in you ; he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, by his Spirit, that dwelleth in you*. In a Word, *Christ* is our Head, and we are his Members ; and because he, and we, do make up one Body ; and because, as Members of such his Body, we are quickned by his Spirit ; therefore we may confirm our *own* Resurrection by *his*. And therefore, as he is called *the First-born from the Dead*, in the First to the *Colossians*,

ans, ver. 18. so we are called *the Children of the Resurrection*, in the Twentieth of St. Luke, ver. 36. So that a good Man, from the Certainty of his *Saviour's* Resurrection from Death to Glory and Immortality, may safely conclude his *own*; may lie down in his *Grave* as securely, as in his *Bed*; and when the Morning of the Great Day shall dawn forth, may be *more* secure of rising again, and putting on his *Body*; than he can be, that he shall rise on the *Morrow-morning*, and put on his *Clothes*: For, for the *first* he has the Security of *Truth* and *Omnipotence*; but for the *last* he has only the Promises of his own *Presumption*, or (at the very best) but of his *Hope*.

4. As the Faithful shall, in Consideration of our Saviour's Death and Resurrection, obtain their own Resurrection from *Death* to *Life*; so the Life, which by such their Resurrection they shall obtain, shall be *Life Eternal*. This is express Scripture; and a *Christian* may therefore be satisfied in, and assured of its Truth. For, our Saviour himself tells us as much, when giving an Account of the Last Judgment, he closes such Account, in the Last Verse of the Twenty fifth Chapter of St. *Matthew*, with these Words; [*And these shall go into everlasting Punishment*:] and then follows that, which is directly to our present Purpose, [*But the Righteous into Life Eternal*.]

And Reason tells us, that so it must needs be; because where the *Cause* of all Death whatsoever is taken away, there the *Possibility* of Death must be taken away too; unless we should imagine, that Death should be brought upon a Rational Creature, subject to Law, without any meritorious Cause of Death at all. But (as we have often laid it down, and proved it already) that cannot be supposed in the present Case; because the Death, we now speak of, is supposed to come from *God's Justice*; and the *Justice* of God cannot either truly, or rationally be supposed to inflict Death *there, where* there is no Desert of it. Now, we therefore know, that the meritorious Cause of Death is Sin, because we know, that *the Wages of Sin is Death*. If therefore, as we have already seen, the Sin of the Faithful be *taken away* by the *Expiation*, and if upon their Resurrection they obtain an *indefectible* Holiness; the Inference will be, That the Cause of Death, Sin, will upon the *first* Account be *cancelled*, and *blotted out*; and that, upon the *last* Account, it cannot be *renewed* or *restored*; and that therefore, upon *both* Accounts in conjunction, Death, the Wages of Sin, can never more *return*. And then, when a Life restored is secured from all possible return of Death, we may be sure, that such Life so restored must be Eternal. And agreeable to what we now say, St. Paul tells us, in the
Third

Third to the *Philippians*, the last Verse, that our Saviour, whom we look for from Heaven, *shall change our vile Body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious Body, according to the mighty working, whereby he is able even to subdue all Things unto himself.* Now we know, that when our Saviour appeared to St. Paul, that is, to that very Apostle who tells us these Things, he does expressly affirm to King *Agrippa*, in the Twenty sixth of the *Acts*, that *the Light of the Appearance was above the Brightness of the Sun*, (and yet the Context will tell us, that the Appearance was made *about Mid-day.*) And perhaps our Saviour's Transfiguration on the Mount was a Proleptick Discovery of that Glory, with which his Body was to be cloathed upon his Ascent into Heaven, the Mount of God. But be that as it will; yet to our Purpose: If the Bodies of the Saints shall be *fashioned like unto his glorious Body*, then it will be no improbable Conclusion, That they shall with that Glory put on an *Immortal* Frame and Constitution. And this Conclusion will then advance from Probable to Certain, when we know, that the same Apostle does acquaint us, not only, that our Body, *which is sown in dishonour, shall be raised in glory*; but, over and above, that *this Corruptible must put on Incorruption*, and that *this Mortal must put on Immortality*. Much more might be offered on this Subject; but, from what has been

glanced at, we may now perceive, that our Body, in imitation of our Saviour's Body, shall after its Resurrection be indued with a glorious Frame, and an immortal Constitution; that it shall be done by his *Power*, as it shall in Consideration of his *Merit*; that the Power that shall do it, is *able to subdue all Things to it self*, that is, is Omnipotent. And then, where we have the *Promise* of *Truth*, and the *Power* of *Omnipotence*, to secure to us an Eternal Life; there we can have no Reason to *doubt* the Eternity of such Life.

The Second Thing should now in Order follow, which is to shew, wherein the Happiness of such Eternal Life does consist. But before we speak to that, I shall lay down two or three Practical Considerations; which, as they look *back* to what has been spoken *already*, so will be no improper *Introduction* to those Things which are to *follow*.

1. And first, We should be sensible of, and grateful for that blessed Provision, that our Lord and Saviour has made for our Everlasting Happiness and Security. And this we should so much the rather be, because, by what has been said, we may now understand, that such Provision does fully answer to our highest natural Desires and Inclinations. For, our Anxiety for our own Welfare will tell us, that among all the several Appetites, by which we pursue after our own Happiness,

our Desire of *Life* does hold the *first* and *chief* Place with us. And the Reason is plain, because the Loss of *Life* must needs be followed by the Loss of all *other* Enjoyments whatsoever, that can in any wise conduce to our Happiness. And, as we are told by our Common Sense, that our grand and topping *Appetite* is that of *Life*; so we are told by the same Common Sense, that *Immortality* is a sure *Fence* for that Life. If therefore God has graciously made Provision for the Gratification of this our most exalted Appetite, by securing to us a future Immortality; and if, over and above, he has engaged to secure that very Immortality from the Loads and Incumbrances of all those Miseries, which do constantly attend our Mortal Life in this World: I say, if God has done so great Things for us, we ought to look upon our selves to be obliged in Gratitude to endeavour a Return (as far as our slender Abilities go) in some measure proportionate to the Almighty Bounty. For, if ever our Thanks be due to any one whomsoever; then most certainly they must be so to him, who is willing, and able, and has promised to gratifie the *utmost* Pitch, and the most *exalted* Desires of our own Self-love.

2. Has God provided an Immortal and Secure Life for us in *another* World? Then that should engage us not to set up for Happiness in *this*. For, tho' it be granted, that the

Good Things of *this* Life are *present*, and at *hand*; but that those of a *better* Life are lodged at a *distance*; and so we are engaged in our Pursuit after the *first* by our *Senses*, but we can only pursue the *last* by our *Faith* or *Hope*: Yet, because our Experience, upon innumerable Repetitions, has constantly convinced us, that our *Senses* have alway *deceived* us, (for, our highest and most exalted Enjoyments here do always determine in Emptiness and Dissatisfaction :) I say, for this single Reason, (if yet there were no other) we should for the future rather seek for the Happiness we desire there, where our *Faith* tells us, it may be *had*; than to repeat our Disappointments, by pursuing it there, where our *Experience* has convinced us, that it *cannot*. Alas! a very little Consideration may satisfy us, that in our Attempts after Happiness by the Pursuit of the Good Things of *this* Life, we always blunder; and that too, whether we *do*, or do *not* obtain those Good Things, which we so pursue. For, if we do *not*, then we lose our desired Happiness by our *Disappointment*: But if we *do*, then either *they* must *leave us*, by reason of their *slipperiness* and *uncertainty*; or *we* must *leave them*, by reason of our *Mortality*. And then, be it *one*, or be it *the other*, the Case is much one and the same; for, in both Cases, the expected Happiness vanishes. And because by this we may perceive, that we cannot be
made

made happy by any Thing in *this* Life; therefore,

3. Let us be exhorted to seek our Happiness in a *future* Life; that is, (as has appeared) to seek it there, where it may be *had*. For, if Happiness be to be had any where, undoubtedly it is to be had in the Favour and Presence of God; who, as he is the undoubted Author of all *Things*, so for that Reason alone he is the undoubted Author of all that *Happiness*, which we can possibly reap from the Enjoyment of any Good whatsoever. Now, because the same Revelations, which have discovered to us a Future and Immortal Life, have also acquainted us, that that Life is lodged in the kind and favourable Presence of God, that is, in Heaven; and because we know, that no unholy or impure Thing shall come into the Presence of him, who is of *purer Eyes, than to behold Iniquity*: Therefore, to the present *Exhortation*, let me add this *Direction*, and that is, That we pursue our future *Glory* and *Immortality* (or *Eternal Life hereafter*) by an *holy* Life *here*. For, the true and solid Reason, why there is no *Misery* nor *Death* in Heaven, is because there is no *Sin* nor *Wickedness* there. For, Death and Misery are so far forth the inseparable Companions of Sin and Wickedness, that, as where-ever we find the *last*, there we are sure to find the *first*; so, where the *first* are not, there we may be sure, that the *last* are shut

out. And therefore, because *Mortality* and *Misery* have no Place in Heaven, we may, for that Reason, stand confirmed, that *Sin* and *Impiety* have no Place there neither. If therefore we do in good earnest design to be lodged in those Regions of Happiness, we must first be sure to cast off our Sins, and to leave them behind us. For, so sure as Death is the Wages of Sin, so sure it is, that Immortality and Happiness shall not be the Portion of the Impenitent. And so long as God is in his own Nature Holy, and that is, so long as he is God, so long he must be displeased with all those, who are pleased with, and make much of Sin, the grand Enemy of such his Nature, because the grand Enemy of such his Holiness.

CHAP. XIV.

Wherein the Happiness of Eternal Life does consist. Several Reflections, and Considerations on what has been said, tending to promote an Holy Life.

HAVING in the last Chapter shewed, by what Means we are put into the Possession of an Happy and Eternal Life, the Purchase of our Saviour's Merits : We must in this, according to our Promise, inquire wherein the Happiness of such Life does consist.

And, in answer to this Inquiry, we lay it down, in short ; That the Consummate Happiness of the Saints in Eternal Life, does consist in that Joy, Pleasure, and full Satisfaction, which results from their *Loving the Lord their God with all their Heart, with all their Soul, with all their Strength, and with all their Mind* ; and from their Enjoyment of God (the Party beloved) and his Love. I have chose to express the Love of the glorified Saints to God, in the Words of Scripture, because they seem to me to contain in them such an Intense Love, under so large and comprehensive an Expression, that, had I delivered it in other Words, I should more than have doubted, that I should have fallen short.

short of the Thing. And I do believe, that such Caution will then appear to be no scrupulous Nicety, when we shall come seriously to weigh and consider those Things that follow.

I. And first, we take notice, what every one may easily be satisfied of by their own Experience, That we love *our selves* best, that is, before and beyond all other Persons, and all Things whatsoever. And there neither is, nor can be any doubt, but that such our Inclination is planted in us at our first Formation, by the Hand of God himself. And therefore neither does God ever require of us to slight or cast it away, but by such Motives, that will more than recompense all the Evil, that we do, or can suffer, by our so doing. And therefore he, who in the Cause of God and Goodness shall so far undervalue his own Welfare, as to part with that Welfare (be it what it will) for the sake of such Cause, may be sure of a Compensation from God's Hand, that shall repair his Damages with advantage, and that too, tho' what he so parts with be Life it self. And therefore it was a fixed and undoubted Persuasion in the Primitive *Christians*, that whosoever suffered Martyrdom for his Saviour's, and Religions sake, was certainly thereupon crowned with Glory; and with them, to be a Martyr, and to be crowned, were equivalent Expressions; for, they meant the same Thing,

Thing, whether they made use of the one or of the other. So confident were they of the Truth of their Saviour's Promise, in the Nineteenth of *St. Matthew*, ver. 29. *Every one that hath forsaken Houses, or Brethren, or Sisters, or Father, or Mother, or Wife, or Children, or Lands, for my Names sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting Life :* and of that in the Tenth Chapter of the same Evangelist, ver. 39. *He that loseth his Life for my sake, shall find it.* By which we may understand, that God does so far allow our Self-love, the Work of his own Hand, that where, for his sake, we are willing to lay it aside in *lesser* Matters, there he has, in requital for our so doing, obliged himself to provide for the *gratification* of it in *greater* Matters.

Now, tho' it be confessed, that there is a Thing too frequently, and too kindly entertained among Mankind, which wears the Name of Self-love; and which is not only commonly accounted, but which also really is in it self *Criminal*: Yet, if we narrowly look into such Crime, we shall find, that it is not *therefore* a Crime, because it is *Self-love*, but because it *excludes* our Love of *others*. It is indeed kind to *it self*, (as all Self-love, and that too in the Nature of the Thing, must needs be) but then it is kind to *very few* or *none* besides. And therefore the Viciousness of it consists, not so much in
doing

doing what it *does*, as in *not* doing what it *ought* to do: That is, the Self-love, so far as it is only Self-love, is innocent: But it then becomes a Sin, when it advances to Uncharitableness. For, every Man is allowed (perhaps in a degree required) to love himself; but no Man is allowed, no not upon the Pretence of such his Love, to hate another. Nay, he may love himself best; but by so doing, he must not shut out all others from any *Share* in his Love; nor (where his Circumstances and Condition, measured by the Standard of Common Humanity, or Christian Charity, will allow him so to do) must he shut out others from the *Proofs* and *Evidences*, that he allows them such a Share. So that as we are satisfied by our own Sense of the Thing, (and that is as great a Satisfaction, as we are capable of in any Case whatsoever) that we *love* our selves best; so, by what has been said, it may now appear, that we do not *transgress* any Duty of Morality or Religion by our so doing.

2. Our next Proposition must be, That as we love our selves best, so our *Love* of any Person or Thing *besides* is *directed* by and to our *Self-love*. For, we therefore love any *Thing*, because it does, or at least because we think it may conduce to our *own* Welfare and Happiness. For, all Love has in it a Mixture of Desire; and then, as the Love of our selves is accompanied with a Desire
of

of our own Welfare; so, because we love our selves *best*, all our other Desires must, for that Reason, be in a *subordination* to that. And therefore, tho' our Love to other Men may engage us to do very great and considerable Kindnesses to *such* Men; yet, for all that, we should not do so, did we not, by so doing, gratifie *our selves*. For, tho' it is confessed, that because our Kindnesses to them proceeded from our Love to them, that therefore we design to please and gratifie them by our Kindnesses; yet it is full as true, that if *their* Pleasure and Gratification were not pleasant and grateful to *our selves*, we should leave those Kindnesses undone, by which we designed such their Pleasure and Gratification. And as it is thus notorious, that our Love to *other Persons* is finally resolved into the Love of *our selves*; so it is as, if not *more* notorious, that our Love of *Things* is so. For, Things have no Sense of our Kindness to them; and therefore our Kindness to them, were it for their sakes, would be irrational and absurd; for there could no Account be given of it in Reason, or Nature. But because we our selves are capable of *receiving* a Benefit from Things, by our having a Sense of such Benefit; and because we are capable of *apprehending* such our Benefit, *before* we do *obtain* them, as well as *when* we do *possess* and *enjoy* them; therefore we may from thence be satisfied,
that

that our Love, and therefore also our Desire of them, does spring from such our Apprehension of our *own* Benefit; and we may be sure, that the Desire of such our own Benefit does come from our Self-love. So that now we may be as well convinced, that our Love to *other Persons*, or to *Things*, does proceed from our *Self-love*, under *this* Head; as under the *last* we might, that we love *our selves* best.

3. Let our Third Proposition then be this: That we find in our selves, and that too by our own Sense (I may say, Feeling) of the Thing, such a *Want* of that, that will satisfie the Desires of our Self-love, that we are constrained by such our Self-love, (that is, we are constrained by Nature; for Self-love, as we have seen, is natural;) I say, we are constrained by Nature to seek for a Supply for such our Want from *abroad*; that is, we are constrained to seek for it *out* of our selves. This might be abundantly proved from the great Variety of these our Wants, which can only be relieved by a *Foreign* Supply; and those too, Wants, not only of our *Bodies*, but of our *Minds*; without our obtaining of which, we do account our selves in a degree *miserable*; at least, not *so* happy, as to gratifie our *Self-love*. But the Thing being Natural, and our Conviction of its Truth being so too, it needs not. And therefore I would have it here remarked, that my chief Aim in
laying

laying down this Proposition, is to adjust the Coherence, and by consequence the Proof of my main Design, which is to shew, wherein our Grand and Eternal Happiness does consist.

But yet (because it may in some measure conduce to such our Design) we shall, before we quit this Proposition, leave this Remark upon it: That it is not *unlikely*, if it be not *certain*, that God in our very Formation has so ordered our natural Frame and Constitution, that as the Desires of our *Self-love* cannot be answered nor supplied by our *Self-sufficiency*; so, that such our Desires should carry our Thoughts abroad to seek such Supply *elsewhere*. Which is (if I may so speak) the first Step, to which we are obliged by Nature, in order to our seeking after *God*. And in the next place, That God has made all Things in this World, within the compass of our possible Purchase, so inadequate to the Desires of our Self-love, that when we do actually obtain such Things, our highest and most exalted Enjoyment of them does still *fall short* and does never *fill* or *satisfy* such our Desires. Which is the Second Natural Step to bring us to *God*.

4. This Remark then being left by the way; let our Fourth Proposition be this: That the *more* we *know*, or *believe*, that other Persons or Things will answer to, and satisfy the Desires of our Self-love; the *greater* Value

Value we put upon them; and the greater Value we put upon them, the more we love them. The Truth of which Proposition is as certain, as it is certain, that we desire to gratifie our Self-love: And it is as certain, that we desire to gratifie our Self-love, as it is certain, that we have such a Thing in us as Self-love. For, because our Self-love consists in a Desire of our own Gratification; and because a Desire of our own Gratification contains in it a Love of those Persons or Things, from which we expect to receive such Gratification: I say, for these Reasons, to suppose, that we shall not love such Things or Persons in proportion to that Gratification, which we expect to receive from them, is to suppose us to contradict those very Desires, which yet at the same time we do professedly entertain. We shall therefore take our present Proposition for good and true, and that is, That we must needs love all Persons and Things according as we think or know, that they will answer to, or gratifie the Desires of our Self-love.

5. The natural and immediate Effect of our Love of any Person or Thing, is a Desire of *possessing* or *enjoying* the Person or Thing so loved. For, our *Desire* of any Person or Thing includes in it our present *Want* of such Thing or Person. Now, if such our Want were not at home, that is, in our selves, we need not seek abroad, or out of our selves,

for

for a Supply of it. And because the Want, which in the present Case we feel in our selves, is *fixed* and *immovable*, and so cannot stir abroad ; therefore that, that must supply such Want, must be *brought home* to it. Our Supply then must be caused by the *Union* of that Thing or Person to our selves, which is to supply such Want. And when that Thing or Person is united to our selves, then, and not before, we may be said to possess or enjoy such Thing or Person.

I do believe, that the Truth of this Proposition may be doubted ; because we may be satisfied with the Assurance of our Friend's *Kindness*, tho' we do not enjoy his *Company*. And something very like it may be said of the Satisfaction that we take in several Things, tho' at a distance from us. But when it is considered, that tho' we do not enjoy the *Company* of our absent Friend, yet for all that, we do at that very time enjoy his *Friendship* ; and that tho' his *Person* be *absent* from us, yet that the *Assurance* of his Friendship is *present* with us, and *lodged* in our *Breasts* ; we may then begin to be satisfied, that so far forth as our Desires are gratified, or our Want supplied, so far forth that, which does so gratifie or supply them, 'is *present* with us, which is an *assured Satisfaction* of our Friend's Love and Kindness to us. But then we must take notice, that if our Desires do extend themselves farther ; as suppose, if

our Love of him engages us to desire the *Presence* of his *Person*, as earnestly as the *Assurance* of his *Friendship*; then, in such a Case, as our Desires and our Want are more than barely the Desire and Want of his *Friendship* and *Kindness*; so such our greater Desire and Want cannot be supplied, but by the *Presence* and *Enjoyment* of his *Person* and *Company*. And therefore, strictly speaking, our Desire of his *Company* proceeds from our Love of his *Person*; but our Desire of his *Friendship* proceeds from our Love of such *Friendship*, which is a *Thing*, and not a *Person*. But then it must be granted, that no Man can love another, but that, according to the Degree of such his Love, he must desire his *Company* too; and that the want of his *Company* would be attended with an *Affliction* proportionate to the Degrees of his Love; if the *Absence* of his *Person* were not in some measure compensated by the *Assurance* of his *Friendship*, which is *present*. And what is thus true of *Persons*, is so also of *Things*. For, we therefore *desire* any *Thing*, because we *love* it, and because we *want* it: And then the only way to supply such Want, and to gratifie such our Love, is, by bringing such *Thing* *home* into our own Possession, that is, within the *reach* of our *Enjoyment*. For, an hungry Man may as soon fill his Belly with the Meat that remains in the Market, while he carries at home, as any Man's Love

of any Thing or Person can be gratified, while that Person or Thing is out of the reach of his Possession or Enjoyment. For, as it is absurd to imagine, that any Man can love any Person or Thing, without any Desire to possess or enjoy them ; so it is equally absurd to think, that he can possess or enjoy them, while they are at a distance from him.

These Five Propositions I have laid down, as previous and introductory to the making out the Truth, which we now pursue ; and that is, That the Happiness of our Eternal Life will consist in that Pleasure and Satisfaction which we shall take in our Love and Enjoyment of God, and in his Love of us. For, it is obvious, because natural, for us to conceive, that all possible Happiness (be that Happiness what it will) must come from something that is grateful to our Inclinations, that is, from something which we love ; and therefore also from something, which (if we want it) we do also desire : That what we so want and desire, cannot make us happy, till we possess and enjoy it ; because till then our Desires are not fulfilled : That our Make and Frame is such, that we feel in our selves that we do want That, that must make us happy ; and that therefore, if we will obtain it, we must seek for it abroad, and out of our selves : And lastly, That our Self-love does, and that too necessarily, engage us to seek after such Thing : I say, these

are natural and easie Truths, and (as we shall perceive presently) such, as will lead us into the Discovery of what at present we do only enquire after, *viz.* The Nature of our Eternal Happiness; or, Wherein our Eternal Happiness shall consist.

And that we may from Enquiry advance to Discovery, I would offer it to Consideration, in the first place.

1. That when our *Souls* and *Bodies* shall be refined, by the *Resurrection* and *Glorification* of the *last*, and by the *compleat Holiness* of the *first*; that then we shall have such a true Sense of the great and supereminent Value of *Holiness*, that we shall upon that Account love that *above* and *beyond* all Things *besides*. For then we shall perceive and know, that God *therefore* makes us *holy*, that *so* he may make us *happy*: That our *Happiness begins*, when our *Holiness does*; and that it is then *perfected*, when our *Holiness is so*: That *Holiness* is the Perfection of *God's Nature*, and of *our own*: That where *Holiness* is in its most exalted Excellence and Perfection, it is the same Thing with *Wisdom* and *Truth*, with *Omniscience* and *Omnipotence*; and that it is the true and only Fountain of all real and rational Happiness. And then, that which is the *Fountain* of all *Happiness*, and by consequence of our *own Happiness*, must, when once it appears so to us, be the *Object* of our *greatest Love*, as sure as it is, that we do love our selves best.

2. Where

2. Where we find such Holiness (which we shall be better acquainted with by our Glorification and compleat Sanctification) in its *greatest* and most *exalted Perfection* and *Excellence*; there our Love of such Holiness must in Nature and Reason, (and our Reason will then be exactly refined and discerning;) I say, that where we find Holiness in its *greatest* and most *exalted Perfection* and *Excellence*, there our *greatest* and most *intense Love* of Holiness will be lodged. For, when we come to love Holiness for its own Excellence and Perfection; then we shall be sure to love that Holiness *most*, which has the *greatest* and most *exalted Excellence* and *Perfection*.

3. This our *greatest* and most *intense Love* of the *greatest* and most perfect Holiness, will (as we may rationally conceive) be still augmented and increased, when we apprehend it as lodged in an Intelligent Being. For, our Love (and that too in Nature) to *such* a Being, is (*cæteris paribus*) greater than our Love of *Things*; because *such* a Being is (if I may so speak) more congenerous and cognate to us, than *Things* are; and we find the *Harmony* and *Sympathy* to be in Nature always *greater* there, where there is the *nearest Cognation*. The further Use which we make of this Proposition, besides that already laid down, is to unite our Love of *God* and our Love of *Holiness* together, and so to

exhibit them under one View ; as indeed in God they are but one and the same Thing. And therefore, in what follows, we must alter our Phrase ; and what hitherto we have called our Love of Holiness, must hereafter be styled our Love of God.

4. Our Love of our most Holy God will still receive a considerable Addition of Increase, when we shall come to know, that his *Holiness* is not only most *perfect* and *exalted* ; but that it is also accompanied with all other *Excellencies* and *Perfections*, and that too in the highest and most perfect Degree. For, tho' God be One with his Holiness, and all other his Attributes ; yet it may be doubted at least, whether the Capacities even of glorified Creatures shall ever be so enlarged, as to apprehend his Beauties and Excellencies any otherwise, than by distinct and separate Conceptions : Nay, it may be more than doubted, whether those their Conceptions shall be adequate to those his (to them) several Beauties and Excellencies, which shall be the Objects of such their Conceptions. For, it is hard to conceive, that the glorified Capacities of Creatures shall be made Infinite by their Glorification ; and unless they be so, we are sure, that the most Seraphick Conceptions must needs fall short of the Dignity of their Object. And we know, that it is sufficient for any Creature to have its Creature-capacities (when most enlarged and refined)

fin'd) fill'd and satiated by Happiness. For, no Creature is *capable* of, and no Creature can *desire* more, than a full and compleat Happiness: And that Happiness is most certainly full and compleat, which is as much as he can contain.

5. The Increase of our Love to our most Holy God will still grow *greater* by our Assurance, that he loves *us* again. For, it is a Truth in Nature, That, as Love slighted or refused does by that Means grow cold, and so in time languishes and expires; so, if it be kindly received, and answered by Love again, it therefore grows the warmer, because then its Hopes begin to turn into Happiness. And, as Love for Love between *Mankind* carries in it *Gratitude* and *Requit*; so the Love of *God* for the Love of *Man* carries in it *Recompence* and *Reward*: And in *both* Cases it increases the *Happiness* and *Delight*. And then certainly it must be Infinite Happiness to be blessed with the Love of him, who is Infinitely Happy in *himself*, and the undoubted *Author* and *Fountain* of all possible Happiness to all *others*. For, all Love *wishes* well to the Party beloved at *least*; and where its Power answers to its Wishes, *does* well too. And then, when once we are in possession of *God's Love*, we are therefore secure of our *own Happiness*, because we are secure, that all possible Happiness is within the Reach of his Power. And indeed, to suppose the glori-

fied Saints love of God, and by consequence their *Holiness* to *be* perfect, and to suppose their *Happiness* not to be so, would be in effect to suppose the *Creature*, in its Love to *God*, to outdo *God* in his Love to the *Creature*. No! Perfect Holiness, where-ever it is, is a Ray of his leading and most beloved Attribute: And we can in Reason no more conceive, that God will not love such an *Holiness*, than we can conceive, that he does not love *himself*. And then we may be sure, that the Happiness of the Creature will in the final Issue (and of that only we speak at present) bear a Proportion to its Holiness.

6. The Increase of our Love to God will still grow greater and greater, when we come to find, as most certainly we shall so find it, that his Love of us will engage him to *unite* us more intimately to *himself*. The Union of the glorified Saints with God, is, it must be confessed, a great Mystery; for so that must needs be, which *neither Eye hath seen, nor Ear heard, nor can it enter into Man's Heart to conceive*; and which therefore he can much less *express* with his *Tongue*. But yet that such a Thing there will be, we may be satisfied by those Discoveries, that Revelation has afforded us of it in the general. For, it is most certain, by such Discoveries, that we shall at least so enjoy *God*, as we do our *Friend*; we shall appear in his Presence; in that Presence, where there is fulness of Joy; and

and at his *Right-hand*, where there are *Pleasures for evermore*. It is true indeed, that the Nature and infinite Variety of all sorts of Unions (and, among the rest, undoubtedly of those, which God has reserved for future Accomplishments, and for future Discovery) are laid out of the Reach of all mortal Understandings. And therefore we shall rest our selves satisfied with what is *certain*; or, at least, with what, by the help of Revelation, we may easily *believe* to be so: That the Union of the Blessed with God in Heaven will be such, as shall be sufficient for the mutual Communications of each others Love; of the Love of the *Creature* in *Duties* and *Praises* offered up to God; of the Love of God in the Effusions of such *Joy* and *Delight*, such *agreeable Transports* and *Ecstasies*, as shall fill the utmost Capacities of his Chosen ones; and shall therefore exceed their *Hopes* and *Wishes*, because their *first* Knowledge of such their Happiness can only come from their *Experience* of it; and that Experience alone will fully answer to, and gratifie their Self-love.

7. Lastly, The Love of the glorified Saints to God will be still further augmented, and indeed receive its full Complement and Perfection, by their Assurance, that all that Happiness, of which they stand possessed at *present*, shall be *eternal*. For, a Fear of a Failure for the future, may dash the Relish of the

the highest Enjoyment for the present; and our Satisfaction in the Possession of any Good Thing (be it what it will) must needs be abated, if it be accompanied with a Doubt of its Continuance. But Happiness with Security must needs be compleat and perfect. Nay, it must be so much the more compleat and perfect; because tho the *Continuance* of Happiness be *future*, yet the *Assurance* of such Continuance is *present*; and by such *Assurance* we do in some Degree compendiously, and at the same time, enjoy both our *present* and our *future* Happiness. Now the Blessed in Glory may *therefore* be *secure* of the *Eternity* of their Happiness, because God's Love stands *immutably* engaged to their *Holiness*, forasmuch as such their *Holiness* is *indefectible* and *eternal*. For, where *that* is eternal, his *Love* most certainly is so too.

To conclude, in a few Words: Our Love of *our selves* makes us *desire* to be happy: But it must be our Love of *something else*, that must *make* us so. For, if the Love of our selves could of it self *make* us happy, then it could not for that Reason engage us to *desire* to be so. And nothing can conduce to our Happiness, much less can any thing compleat it, but what is entertained by our Love.

When therefore we *fix* our Love upon that, which will answer the Desires of our Self-love; we may then be sure, that we love *that*, which *may* make us *happy*; and when

we come to *possess* and *enjoy* that, which we *so* love, we may be sure, that we *shall* be happy; and if our Enjoyment of it be *securely* eternal, we may then be farther assured, that we shall be *always* so. And that our perfect Love of God, and our Enjoyment of his Love and Favour, will bring all these things to pass, we hope our foregoing Discourse has made good.

I. Now if the Happiness of our future State in Glory shall come from *our* Love of God, and *his* Love of *us*; then this should teach us to have a care, that we do not make our selves unfit for the Happiness of Heaven, by our Uncharitableness whilst we live here upon Earth. For, the Love of God will hardly be *perfected* in that Man, who does not love his Neighbour. For, *He who loveth not his Brother, whom he hath seen; how shall he love God, whom he hath not seen?* And he, who does not *love* God *here*, how shall his Love to him be *perfected hereafter*? For, that that is not, can never be made perfect. And, he whose Love to God shall never be made perfect, how shall he be ever made happy? For, there can be no Happiness, no not in Heaven it self, without our perfect Love of God. It is remarkable, that our Saviour, when he taught his Disciples to pray, (tho' he taught them to pray for *several* Things) yet annexes a *Condition* to that Petition *alone*, by which they were to beg *Forgiveness* of their

their Sins ; and afterwards gives them a Reason for his so doing ; because *if they forgive not Men their Trespases, neither will their Father, who is in Heaven, forgive them their Trespases.* By which we may understand, that as we shall not be admitted into Heaven, unless we be made *like* to God ; and as we shall not be admitted into Heaven, unless *God* does forgive us *our* Sins ; so neither shall we be admitted into Heaven, unless *we* be in *this* like to *God*, that we do forgive their Sins to *others*. In one Word, the malicious, ill-natur'd, and uncharitable Man is one of the worst Companions in the World : For, he is very apt to do it *always* ; and for the *most* part *actually* does make all People uneasie, where he comes ; and from thence we may be satisfied, that he is very unlikely to come in for a Share of *that* Happiness, which consists in *Love*. And for that Reason, we may be satisfied also, that till he lays aside his Uncharitableness, it will be impossible, that he should be made Partaker of the Happiness of the Blessed.

2. If our eternal Happiness must come from our ardent and eternal Love of *God* and *Holiness* ; then we should have a care, that we do not place our Religion, and by consequence our Hopes of eternal Happiness, in such Things, which have *no* real Holiness in them. For, it is a very great Mistake, (which yet perhaps runs thro' all Sorts of *Christians*)

to

to think, that such Things, that are not good and holy, will for ever make them happy. For, too many People do place not only their *Religion*, but their *Zeal* for it too, in such little, and in themselves insignificant Observances and Practices, which may be *done*, or may be *let alone*; and yet all the while they themselves be never the more either religious or holy. For, what Holiness (for Instance) can the Confession of the Sinner, or the Absolution of the Priest, confer upon that Man, who has no other Design in his Confession, but that he may go on to sin upon a new Score, and so continue his Sin with a better Relish, and with the less Reluctance? Or, What Holiness can the strict Observance of the Sabbath beget in that Man, who therefore only obliges himself to a greater Severity upon that Day, that he may by that Means compound with his Conscience for his fraudulent Dealings, or his profligate and vicious Life, all the rest of the Week? Or, How can any Man be the more holy, because he lists himself under this or that Party or Sect; when all the while he takes no care to do what God commands, or to avoid what God forbids? No! no! Holiness is a real Thing, tho' it be not the Object of our Senses: And this Thing only lodges in that Heart, which by an humble Obedience conforms it self to God's Will, and which, by hearkning to his Voice, is conformed to his Likeness.

Likeness. And if any Man thinks to become Holy by any other Means, he does but deceive his own Soul, and by a fond and foolish Imagination exclude himself from that Happiness, which shall only be bestowed upon those, who shall be made like to him, who is most happy ; that is, who shall be *holy*, as *he is holy*. All they then who would make themselves *happy*, must take care, that they make themselves *holy*. They must, I say, *do so* ; and they must be *pleased*, that they *have* so done. For, he only *loves* God, who *delights* in Holiness ; and he only shall be *happy*, who *loves* God.

3. Since it has appeared, that our most consummate Happiness does come from our perfect Love of Holiness ; and since perfect and unmixed *Happiness* is most certainly our *Aim* : we do from thence conclude, That *Holiness* ought in Prudence to be our *Practice*. For, as it is a Short-sightedness, and (at least) a Degree of Folly, not to *seek* our Happiness *there*, where it *may* be *found* ; so not to seek it there, where we are *truly*, because *rationally* informed, that it may be found, is *Madness*. For, that Man may well be taxed of Frenzy, who will not take that Way to Happiness, to which he is directed by such Advice, which is inculcated by the joint Suggestions of Revelation and Reason, that is, by the ordinary and extraordinary Light, that God holds out to direct him in such Way.

Now,

Now, to set home this Exhortation, by convincing Men, that the true and rational Way to their Happiness is by Holiness, (besides all that has hitherto been offered) I would propose to their serious Consideration these Things following.

1. That that Religion, which has been confirmed by Prophecies from the Foundation of the World, *before* it was revealed ; and which, *when*, and *after* it was revealed, was confirmed by Multitudes of other *Miracles*, and by the *Resurrection* of him from the Dead, who did reveal it ; must as certainly have God for its Author, as it is certain, that such Miracles and such Predictions could only come from God.

2. The *Christian* Religion, and no other Religion, either truly or falsely so called, is the Religion which has this Character, and therefore has God for its Author.

3. That Religion, which has God for its Author, must needs be a true Religion.

4. That Religion, which has God for its Author, must needs be an holy Religion.

5. Since it is one of the greatest Businesses of Religion to instruct Men how to serve God ; the true Religion must, even because it is true, instruct Men how to serve God *truly*.

6. He who *truly* serves God, who is most *holy*, must do so by living *holily*.

7. He

7. He who lives holily, pleases God : For, he complies with the Instructions of that Religion, of which God is the Author.

8. He who pleases God, by complying with the Instructions of that Religion, of which God is the Author, shall not fall short of the End, that God intended in his Institution of Religion.

Now it is most certain, that God *instituted Religion* for the *Sake and Benefit* of *Man*; and it is as certain, that God *wills* the *Happiness* of *Man* : And therefore it is rational to infer, That God instituted Religion to direct Man in the true Way to Happiness; and that Way (we have seen) is Holiness.

1. From all which I would infer, First, that which is to my present Design, That the only Way for us to obtain Happiness, is by our Practice of Holiness : And, what is not indeed so direct to my purpose, but yet of good use,

2. That the best and surest Way of guiding our Enquiries after the True Religion, will be to keep our Eye, all the while we are so employed, stedfastly fixed upon Holiness. For, we can much better tell what is good and honest, than we can tell what is true. Our Knowledge of the first therefore may prove a very good Guide to us in our Search after the last. To which I would add,

3. That to talk of Truth and Certainty, and much more of Infallibility in Religion, when

when the Determinations and Resolutions of such Certainty or Infallibility are mischievous or pernicious to the real Happiness of Mankind, or any other ways wicked, is Nonsense and Banter; and is in deed and truth an Imposition upon Mens Understandings, in order to damnifie the honest and real Interests, and true Happiness of Mankind. But to return to our Design.

That Men may be the more heartily engaged to *believe* what has been *said*, and to *practise* what they shall so *believe*; I shall still go on to press the present Exhortation more home, by advising them to try the Experiment, whether the Doctrine now delivered (which is, That our Happiness must come from our Practice and Love of Holiness) be true or no. The Proposal is fair and reasonable; and there is no Man who has not one way or other made a great many Experiments in the Case: For, our constant Desire of Happiness will always be putting us upon such Experiments. And I dare be bold to say, before we proceed any farther, that if any Man's Trial has succeeded, his Success does fall in with my Proposal, and back the present Exhortation.

Now, because our Happiness cannot (as we have seen) so much as be supposed to be lodged abroad; but if it be our Happiness, it must, for that Reason, be lodged within us, at home, and in our own possession; there-

Y

fore,

fore, to engage Men to *entertain* our present *Exhortation* the more *heartily*, and by consequence to *make* the Trial of the proposed *Experiment* the more *willingly*; I would desire them, by a serious Reflection, to consider, whether all Wickedness does not constantly bring Misery along with it into that Breast, where it self is entertained. For, if we suppose a Man to be wicked, we must at the same time, for the most part, (for, there is but one excepted Case) suppose, that he knows that he is so. And when that is once supposed, such a Supposition will acquaint us with these following Truths: That he will have *one Thought* employed upon God's *Law*, which commands his *Duty*; and *another Thought* upon his own *Actions*, which *transgress* that *Law*; and a *third Thought*, which shall, by comparing the one with the other, discover the *Disagreement*, nay the *Contrariety*, that is between the *Law*, and such his *Actions*. Now, here are already Thoughts disagreeing and fighting with each other, and by that Means a Civil War raised in his Breast; the Effects of which, in all Cases, are sure to be not only *mischievous*, but *calamitous*. Let us then see a little farther, and let us suppose (what will yet be more than supposed, for it will be certain:) But, I say, let us suppose, that when by *one Thought* the Man has discovered the Contrariety between his *own Actions*, and the *Directive Part* of the Law,

Law, that thereupon he bestows *another* Thought upon the *Vindictive* Part of the Law, (and such a Chain of Thoughts is very natural) and that by *another* Thought he *applies* such Vindictive Part of the Law, that is, the Threat of the Law, to his own Actions, and, by consequence, to his own dear Self. And when this is once done, then we may begin to be satisfied, that Multitudes of other Thoughts will presently rise in his Breast, and those too filled with Doubt, and Fear, and Shame, and Grief, and all those other troublesom, vexatious, and tormenting Passions, which are the natural Effects that follow upon the Contemplation of our own Guilt. Now, when all these boysterous and vexatious Thoughts do oppose themselves *against*, and make violent Assaults *upon* a Man's natural Desire of Ease, Content, and Happiness, what a Storm and Tempest must they, by so doing, raise in that Soul, where they all meet, and where they all rage and contend? The poor Man, in this Case, will (in the Words of the Prophet) be *like the troubled Sea, when it cannot rest, whose Waters cast up Mire and Dirt*: That is, Filth and Wickedness is the Cause of his Disquiet; and Tumult, Confusion, and Agony are the Effects of such Filth and Wickedness: For, *there is no Peace to the Wicked, saith God*; and we may be sure, that what God saith, is true: For, when our own Thoughts do tell us,

that the Miseries which they bring upon us, they do therefore so bring, because we have offended and displeased our God; they do, by so doing, add one *great* Misery to all our *other* Miseries. For, in all other Afflictions we have still a Place of Refuge left; and, like a City besieged, tho' all our Communications with the Comforts of this World be hindred and intercepted, yet our Intercourse with Heaven is still left free and open, and in God we have a sure Retreat. But when our Misery springs from our own Wickedness, we do at the same time lose our *Happiness*, and our *Hopes* of Relief too; because our Misery comes from his Hand, who has all Relief and all Happiness in his own disposal.

I have described these Things in a plain, familiar, and natural Way, because I would have People convinced of their Truth, without the Trouble or Expence of a Trial. (For, tho' I *would* have them try, whether *Goodness* will not make them *happy*; yet I would *not* have them try, whether *Wickedness* will not make them *miserable*.) For, the Experiment in this Case will be too dear and costly. And that must needs be so, which destroys our Peace, by robbing us of the *Peace* of God. And if Men are but in some moderate Degree satisfied of the Truth of these Things, it may be hoped, (and God grant that our Hope do not deceive us) that they will by
that

that means be engaged to try, whether Holiness will make them happy, or no. For, now they have a fair and farther Probability of Success to invite them to such a Trial; because Holiness and Wickedness being contrary the one to the other, our Reason will teach us more than barely to conjecture, that they must produce contrary Effects. For, if (as we have seen) Misery, Confusion, and Agony are sure to be the Effects of Wickedness; it may the more reasonably be expected, that the Effects of Holiness should be Joy and Happiness; and therefore it may be the more reasonably expected also, that Men should be persuaded to pursue their Happiness by the Practice of Holiness.

And it may be farther expected yet, that Men should be so persuaded, because (which yet may seem strange) there is hardly any wicked Man, tho' he be ranked among those whom the World do commonly account Profligate) but who yet has so much Knowledge of the Comforts of Holiness, as might (would he but use his natural Reason in the Case) engage him to attempt the Encrease of such his Comforts, by becoming holy. For, tho' he be guilty of *many*, perhaps of *most* Sins; yet he *cannot* be guilty of *all*. For, Sin is not only an Absurdity in *it self*, and a downright Contradiction to all sober Reason; but it is in many Cases a Contradiction also to it self. For, *one* Sin shall stand in such op-

position to *another*, that it shall in a manner be impossible for *both* of them to be Retainers to the *same* Man. For, it is as impossible to conceive, that a professed and profligate *Debauchée* (while he is what he is) should be an *Hypocrite*, as it is, that he should *proclaim* and *conceal* his Wickedness at one and the self-same time. And yet, even such a *Debauchée*, thus abandoned to all sorts of Vices, as far as *Possibility* and his own *profligate Inclinations* will permit, shall value himself for his Forbearance of that Vice, from which yet he does not therefore forbear, because it is a *Vice*, but because (should he admit it to his Practice) it would *thwart* and *controul* his other many and beloved Vices. And we cannot but sometimes observe, that some Men, who heartily hug Covetousness, and all those Vices which drudge under its Direction, such as are Extortion, Oppression, Fraud, Lying, Perjury, and all manner of Uncharitableness, shall yet raise a Comfort to themselves, because they are sober, and free from Drunkenness. These Things, as strange as they are, yet are too often found to be true. And the present Use that we make of them, is this: That very wicked Men, and even such, whose Vices are very *numerous* and very *black*, shall yet, for all that, perceive such a Beauty and Excellency only in abstaining from other Vices, which are not their *own*. that they shall gather Comfort to themselves

selves from such their Abstinence; and that therefore even such Men are not utterly void of all Sense, that the Practice of Vertue is a pleasant and comfortable Thing; and that, by consequence, there is an Happiness which does attend and follow it. And then, if it be so true, that Holiness or Vertue (for Vertue and Practical Holiness are one and the same Thing;) But, I say, if it be so true, that Holiness has Happiness for its Companion and Follower; that the most *wicked* Men are *sensible* of it, and that all *other* Men do *confess* it; then it is hoped, that the present Exhortation will be admitted, and that is, That all Men would try to make themselves *happy*, by making themselves *holy*. And it will be a very hard Case, if Men will not put themselves to the trouble of trying that Experiment, which their own Sense of the Thing, and the Sense of all other Men besides, will tell them must needs succeed; and which, when it does succeed, must needs make them happy.

And thus far the present Exhortation is more professedly directed to those, who are in a manner utter *Strangers* to the Ways of God, and so have need of a Guide to *enter* them into the right Way.

To all others, I have but One or Two Things to say, and so shall conclude the whole Matter.

1. And first, Because I do suppose them not to be wholly Strangers to Holiness, therefore I would advise them to look back to their own Experience in the Case: And tho' perhaps that Experience may not be much; yet, such as it is, I am very confident, that their own Reflections will tell them, that whenever they *did* any Duty *heartily* and *sincerely*, they did not go without all Comfort, that they *had* so done: That when they have *done* as they *ought*, their Condition has *been* as they *desired*: That when their *Actions* have been guided by their *Conscience*, and their *Conscience* has been guided by *God's* Law, they have thereupon been blessed with calm and comfortable Reflections: That a diligent and constant Discharge of their Duty has therefore kept their *Souls* at peace with *themselves*, because they have then been satisfied, that *God* has been at peace with their *Souls*. Now, such Comforts and smaller Happinesses as these, because they have always accompanied and been proportionate to their *fainter* Love of Holiness, have given in sufficient Evidence, that their *Happiness* shall then be *perfect* and *complete*, when their *Holiness* shall be so: And by having so done, may inforce our present Exhortation, which is, That by *growing* in Grace, and by *improving* in the Love of God and Goodness, they should fit themselves for an *eternal* Happiness. For, by what has been said, they may
now

now begin to be satisfied, that when their Saviour requires of them to *love the Lord their God with all their Hearts, with all their Souls, with all their Strength, and with all their Minds*, he does in effect require of them to love their own *Souls*; since it is by this time notorious, that what in this Case is their *Duty*, will prove not only their true *Way* to Happiness, but that it will also put them into the actual *Possession* of such Happiness.

2. I would add, in the second place, That if we do not sincerely *love* Holiness, and by consequence *desire* it, we shall never attain to the *Perfection* of it: And if we fall short of a *perfect* Holiness, we shall by consequence fall short of *Eternal* Happiness. For, our Saviour will not bestow a *perfect* Holiness there, where it is not *desired*; and it cannot be *desired* there, where it is not *loved*. We must therefore *fit our selves* to be made perfectly holy, as well as he is *willing* to make us so. For, as we have seen already, that those only who *hunger* and *thirst* after Righteousness, shall be *satisfied*; so we shall here add, That those only who are so *satisfied*, shall be *blest*.

A SHORT
INQUIRY,

Whether it does not appear from

The Scriptures,

THAT THE
G O S P E L

OF OUR

Lord and Saviour

JESUS CHRIST

*Shall be made known to those Men
After their Resurrection, to whom it
had never been made known Before
their Death?*

L O N D O N,

Printed for Benjamin Tooke, at the Middle-
Temple Gate in Fleet-street. 1700.

THE PREFACE.

IT may be perceived, by the very Title, that I would be thought (however I have all along worded my self) to propose the following Essay (for so I would chuse to call it) only Problematically. For which Reason I have separated it from the foregoing Discourse, and have cast it here by it self.

If it be found true, it cannot for that Reason be condemned of Novelty, because it is wholly groundd upon the Scripture, and goes no farther, than those Consequences, which That affords, will warrant.

And if it be found true, it may perhaps be found useful also for the Resolving of more Difficulties in Religion, than what it expressly pretends to.

But

THE PREFACE.

But I was unwilling to adventure too far ; and therefore desire the Reader to take it in good Part, such as it, at present, offers it self to him.

T. S.

A SHORT

A SHORT INQUIRY, &c.

IT has been our professed Business, in the foregoing Discourse, to make it out, That *there is no other Name under Heaven, but that of Jesus Christ, given to Men, whereby they must be saved.* Which, because it is a Truth only made known by *Revelation*; and because it is attended with some *Difficulties*, which our *Natural Reason* cannot easily surmount; has therefore (of late especially) been slighted (to say no worse) by some Men, who call themselves *Christians*; but who, for all that, will allow nothing to be necessary to Salvation, but the Belief of a God, and that *Natural Religion*, which is consequent to such Belief; and therefore who are desirous at least to lay aside all Revelation whatsoever.

Now, tho' others, who have looked farther into the Matter, cannot persuade themselves to renounce God's Revelations concerning a Saviour, made to Man in the *Old and New Testaments*, which do indeed carry sufficient Evidence in themselves of their Divine Authority; the main Drift and Design of the

First

First being to foretell and prefigure the Coming of our Lord Jesus the Messiah, with other Things relating to his Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection, &c. And the main Drift and Design of the *Last* being to exhibit to us the Accomplishment of what had been so foretold and prefigured :) For, *the Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy*; and the Spirit of Prophecy is the Spirit of God: Yet even some of these Men do so treat the acknowledged Revelations, as to employ their Reason rather to expound away those Difficulties, than to resolve them; by that means rejecting the most express Meaning of a great Part of the *New Testament*, and so cutting those Knots, which they perhaps therefore only cannot, because they will not try to untie.

Now tho' we have attempted to resolve several such Difficulties, (and some of them in such a way, which, we hope, may persuade thinking Men, that, provided they hold fast the Foundation, they are not always obliged to tread in beaten Paths :) Yet one grand Difficulty still remains; and that is, That if Men are to obtain Salvation by Jesus Christ alone, and if such a Doctrine can only be known by Revelation; then it may seem strange (at least) that the Revelation is not made known to all Men. And it may seem the more strange, that it is not so, because in those very Revelations, which we have of it, we find expressly, that the Salvation

tion designed in *Christ Jesus* was intended for all Men: And it is natural to think, that that which is designed for the *Benefit* of all, should be *exhibited* to all; and that especially, when such Design is the Counsel of *Wisdom* and *Omnipotence*. Besides, if the Revelation of a Saviour was necessary for *any*; then, either immediately or mediately, it must be necessary for *All*; because if any of those Men, to whom it is *not* made, may be saved *without* it; then, so might those, to whom it *was* made; and so the Revelation (as to its *necessity* to Salvation) might have been wholly spared. For which Reason, we cannot think it sufficient to say, that the Saviour knows *all Men*, and so can *save them*; tho' *all Men* do not know the Saviour, and so cannot *believe* on *him*. And therefore the Scriptures of the *New Testament* do expressly assign our Salvation, on *our Part*, to our *Belief*; and they do as expressly make our Saviour the Saving *Object* of such our Belief. And therefore, tho' the Author of *The Reasonableness of Christianity* has shewed himself no great Friend to Articles of Christian Faith, and therefore does at least pretend to wipe away the Necessity of all *other* Articles in our Creed but *this*, That *Jesus of Nazareth* is the *Messiah*; yet he does not adventure *so far*, as to exclude the Necessity of *that* Article. My Business is not with that Author at present; and therefore having taken notice, that he

Z

does

does so far agree with me, I shall proceed: Only I would by the bye remark, That tho' *that* be the first and leading Article of *Christianity*, (for without the Belief of *Jesus Christ* there can no more be any such thing as *Christianity*, than without the Belief of a *God* there can be such a Thing as *Religion*;) yet for all that, it will be true, that as a Religion grounded upon the Belief of the *true* God, may however be a *false* Religion; so a *Christianity* grounded upon the Belief of the *true* Christ, may however be a *false* Christianity. For, as notwithstanding a *Belief*, or, which may be something more, the *Knowledge* of the True God, Men may fall into *Idolatry*; [See *Rom. chap. 1. ver. 21, 22, 23.*] So, notwithstanding the Belief not only of the *true* Christ, but of his *Resurrection* also, Men may have no other Expectations from him, but *Wealth*, *Power*, and *Grandeur* in this World; [See *Acts ch. 1. ver. 6.*] And yet I do hardly think, that a Faith either in the *one* Case or in the *other*, will by that Author be thought a *Saving* Faith: And if it be not, then it will appear a good Conclusion, That in the *last* Case, that is, in the Case of *Christianity*, something *more* is necessary to be believed in order to our Salvation, than barely, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

But, as I said before, this by the bye. That which is directly to our present Purpose, is, That if it be true, that *none* shall be saved, who do not believe in *Jesus Christ*
the

the Saviour ; then how shall we account for the future Condition of those, who in this Life never *heard* of *Jesus Christ*? For, tho' we may out of the Scriptures be taught, That *he who believeth, shall be saved*; and, that *he who believeth not, shall be damned*: Yet still we cannot but know, that that *Disbelief* to which *Damnation* is allotted, must be as contrary to that *Belief* to which *Salvation* is allotted, as *Damnation* and *Salvation* are to each other. Now because that *Belief*, to which *Salvation* is allotted, is an Act of the *Will*, (whatever the Schools teach of Faith being lodged only in the Understanding;) therefore we do conclude, That that *Disbelief*, to which *Damnation* is allotted, must be an Act of the *Will* too. And indeed, since *Damnation* is confessedly the *Reward* of Unbelief; and since this *Reward* is to come from the Hand of such Justice, which cannot *err*; we may from thence be assured, that the Unbelief, to which it is allotted, must be *Criminal*; and we are moreover assured, that nothing can be so, in which the *Will* is not at all concerned. Now, because it is most certain, that those who in this World *never heard* of *Jesus Christ*, do not therefore not believe in him, because they *will* not, but only because they *cannot*: I say, for that Reason it will be unjust to assign that *Damnation* to their Unbelief, that is, by them unavoidable; which is by the Scriptures assigned only to that Unbelief: which is there-

fore *Criminal*, because it is *Voluntary*. Tho' therefore Damnation be by the Scriptures pronounced against that Unbelief, which refuses the Saviour *made known* and *offered* to Men; yet we cannot from thence conclude, that it shall be the Portion of that Unbelief, which is only a Consequence of an *unavoidable* Ignorance of the same Saviour.

And as we cannot from the Scriptures conclude, that they who *never heard* of the Saviour, shall *be damned* for their Unbelief: So neither can we from them conclude, that they shall *be saved*, notwithstanding their Unbelief. For, if a Faith in *Jesus Christ* be, according to the Scriptures, *necessary* to Salvation; it will from thence follow, that they who *want* that Faith, must *go without* that Salvation, to which it is *necessary*.

Now, it may be presumed, that far the *greater* Part of Mankind, if not in *all*, yet in *most* Ages, and that therefore much the *greater* Part of Mankind in *general*, *never* had the Saviour made known to them; which, if it be true, (as we have no reason to doubt the truth of it) then it will follow,

That tho' God has provided a Saviour for all Men; yet by making a Faith in that Saviour a necessary Condition for Man's obtaining the provided Salvation, he has thereby excluded the *greater* Part of Mankind from such Salvation; because by having *determined the Times before appointed*, and the *Bounds*

Bounds of their Habitation, he has by his Providence so placed them in the World, that it is to them impossible to come to so *much Knowledge* of the Saviour, as is *necessary* to their *Belief* in him.

And if this Conclusion be true, it will afford us another, which is, That notwithstanding God has in a Saviour made sufficient Provision for the Salvation of all Men; yet the greater Part of Men shall fall short of such Salvation, and that too without their own Default.

Now, it is freely confessed, that our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the Saviour, laid the Design of *extending* that Salvation, which he purchased, as *wide*, as was the *Merit* of his Purchase; that is, his Purchase was *sufficient* for the Salvation of *all Men*; and he gave such Directions and Injunctions for the Propagating to all Men *so much* Knowledge of such his Purchase, as might be *sufficient* to bring them to that Faith, which might *intitle* them to the *Benefit* of it. And therefore we find, that he commanded his Apostles *to go into all the World, and to preach the Gospel to every Creature*; and that he gave them *Abilities* to obey such his Command, by bestowing on them, and many of those who should be instructed by them, the *Gift of Tongues*, and the *Power of working Miracles*. By which Means there was Provision made for the *Faith* of all, as well as for the *Salvation* of

all; for the *Means*, as well as for the *End*. But yet because,

1. The Propagating the Means of Faith, that is, because the Propagating the Gospel to all Mankind, was left in the *Hand* of *Man*, and, for that Reason, was not likely to be performed according to the *Will* and *Command* of *God*; infomuch that he, who is both *the Author and Finisher of our Faith*, does before his departure out of this World make it a Question, Whether, upon his Return, he should find Faith in it; *Shall the son of man, when he cometh, find faith upon the earth?* And because,

2. As it was likely, that those Men, who had the Means of Faith and Salvation themselves, *would* not; so it has been found by Experience, that they *have* not, at least they have not so *industriously* propagated such Means, as that they should reach to all others: And because,

3. Tho' any Man may defeat the Counsel of God for his *own* Salvation, and (if he do so) his Damnation will not only be *just*, but *necessary*; yet it is not agreeable to the Equity of the Divine Justice, that it should be in the Power of any Man to defeat the Counsel of God for the Salvation of any *other* Man:

I say, from these Things laid together, it may seem no improbable Conclusion, That God will by some way or other make known his Counsel (to *all* Men) for their Salvation, as he has already done so to *some*: And that
he

he will also make them acquainted with the *Conditions*, that he requires of them, in order to their being made Partakers of such Salvation, that is, he will make them acquainted with *Jesus Christ* their Saviour, and with his Doctrine and Laws.

And then, to come up close to that Design, at which we have all along aimed; Since we know by Experience, that God has not by any Means made all Men acquainted with these Things in *this* Life, that therefore he will do it in a *future* Life.

And it seems to me, that he has given us sufficient Grounds to believe, that he will do so, in *those* very Revelations, which he has already afforded us to guide us in the Way of Salvation. For, tho' the *generality* of *Christians*, and, by their Way of wording themselves, whether in their Popular Discourses or in their Writings, one would be inclined to think, that the *generality* of *Divines* too do conceive, that the Resurrection of all Men will be caused at *one* and the *same* time; perhaps invited to such a Persuasion, because, as the Scriptures do tell us, that a Resurrection is in order to a General Judgment, so they do assign but *one* Day to that Judgment, called therefore *the Day of Judgment*: Yet we may do well to consider, That *short* and *general Expressions* are very seldom *complete* and *full Narratives*: And if, in this very Case, the Scriptures, where they descend to a more

particular Account of the Matter, do give us in a *different* Information, and so do assure us, that the Resurrection of all Men shall *not* be at one and the same time; but that there is a *distinct* Period of Time set out for the Resurrection of *some* Men, from that which is appointed for the Resurrection of *others*; then we hope, it will not be thought an Extravagance, if we shall assert, That there will be *more* Resurrections than *one*; or, which perhaps speaks our Meaning plainer, That *several* Sorts of Men, according to the *Variety* of their Behaviour, and other their Circumstances in *this* World, shall be raised, not only in *different* Conditions, but also at *different* Times, in the *next* World: And those Times too (as will appear from what will be spoken hereafter) at Distances considerably remote from each other.

Now, the Scriptures, in the Twentieth Chapter of the *Revelations*, do acquaint us with a three-fold Resurrection.

1. The First is, of those Men, who were *Martyrs for Jesus, and for the Word of God, &c. ver. 4.* By which I understand all the Faithful in *Christ*; tho' I do not in this Place contend the Truth of such Exposition, because I shall have occasion to speak to it hereafter.

2. The Second Resurrection is in *ver. 5.* where we are told, that *the rest of the Dead lived not again, till the thousand Years were finished.*

Now,

Now, those who are said to be *first* raised, in the Fourth Verse, are there also said to *reign with Christ a thousand Years*. Therefore when we are told, in the Fifth Verse, that *the rest of the Dead lived not again, till the thousand Years were finished*, it is implied, that then they *did* live again. So that a *thousand Years* do intervene between the *first* and *second* Resurrection. And tho' it follows in the latter end of the Fifth Verse, [*This is the first Resurrection*;] yet it is evident, that *that* cannot be meant of the Resurrection in the *Fifth Verse*, because we had been before made acquainted with a Resurrection which was a *thousand Years before* it.

I therefore take the whole Sentence in the former part of the Fifth Verse, [*But the rest of the Dead lived not, till the thousand Years were finished,*] to be Proleptical, and to come in in a *Parentthesis*: For, indeed their proper Place is between the Sixth and Seventh Verses.

Let us therefore see how the Sense will go, if we remove them *from* the Place where they stand at present, and place them *between* the Sixth and Seventh Verses.

Ver. 4. *And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand Years.*

Ver. 5. *This is the first Resurrection.*

Ver. 6. *Blessed and holy is he, that hath part in the first Resurrection: On such the second Death hath no power; but they shall be Priests*

Priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand Tears.

Now, if in this Place we bring in those Words in the Fifth Verse, [*But the rest, &c.*] the Sense will go thus ;

Ver. 5. *But the rest of the Dead lived not again, until the thousand Tears were finished.*

Ver. 7. *And when the thousand Tears are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his Prison, and shall go out to deceive the Nations, &c.*

By which it is plain, that if the Sentence at the beginning of the Fifth Verse be removed and placed between the Sixth and Seventh Verses, then the Sense, and the Discourse concerning both the First and Second Resurrection, will be entire and continued, and also will be plain, easie, and natural.

Now, from the Words thus restored to their natural and true Order, we do to our present purpose take notice,

1. That they, who have behaved themselves as *faithful Christians* in this Life, shall be raised *first* in the next Life, 1 Cor. chap. 15. ver. 23.

2. That they shall reign with *Christ* a thousand Years before any of the rest of Mankind shall be raised.

3. That they shall reign with *Christ* here upon Earth, because,

1. The *Dead in Christ shall rise first*, shall with the Faithful that are alive, and remain at

at the Lord's coming, be *caught up* in the Clouds to *meet* the Lord in the Air: From whence we do with Mr. *Mead* infer, That the Lord is at that time coming *down* to the Earth; for otherwise, how should they *meet* him? Consult the First to the *Thessalonians*, chap. 4. towards the latter end.

2. Because the Saints of the First Resurrection shall, after the thousand Years, be besieged in the *beloved City*, *Rev.* 20. ver. 9. But such City comes down from Heaven to *Earth*, *Rev.* 21. ver. 2. And it is evident in the First Text, that the City besieged was upon the Earth. Consult the Second of *Peter*, ch. 3. ver. 13.

4. That they shall never die more, because they shall *ever be with the Lord*, *1 Thes.* ch. 4. ver. 17.

5. That they shall with him judge the *Angels*, *1 Cor.* chap. 6. ver. 3. and probably also, *wicked Men*: See the Second Verse of the same Chapter. Compare also the *Thrones* in the Fourth, with the *great White Throne* in the Eleventh Verse of the Twentieth Chapter of *Revelations*. By all which it is at least suggested, that the Saints of the first Resurrection shall then be with the Lord *Jesus*, when he shall judge both wicked Angels and Men.

6. That as our Saviour, after his own Resurrection, continued upon *Earth* Forty Days,
and

and then ascended into *Heaven*; so his People shall, upon their Resurrection, continue with him upon *Earth* a thousand Years; and afterwards shall go from hence with him, and *be with him, where he is*: For, *they shall ever be with the Lord*; but, *the Earth shall fly away before his Face*, *Rev. 20. ver. 11.*

7. That tho' the *Righteous* shall be *Witnesses* of, because *present* (at least) at the Judgment *passed* upon the *Reprobate*; yet that the *Reprobate* shall not be *present* at that Sentence, by which the *Righteous* shall have their *Reward assigned* them: For, they shall not be raised, till after such Sentence be *passed and over*; *Rev. 20.* compare the Fourth Verse with the Eleventh and following Verses.

8. Neither shall the *Devil* be present at the *blessed Sentence*, and therefore shall not then be permitted to accuse the *Righteous*; because he is bound, and cast into the bottomless Pit, before the Thrones are set, in the Fourth Verse, and is not loosed, till the thousand Years are expired.

One Thing more we must remark upon this First Resurrection, and that is, that it shall not be brought to pass till the Last Day; by which I understand, the last Day of the Oeconomy of this World, or the Day of our Saviour's first Coming to Judgment. Consult *St. John, chap. 6. ver. 39, 40.* At which Day, as the Faithful, whether dead, (and then raised) or remaining, (or not yet dead) *shall*
be

be caught up to meet the Lord in the Air, 1 Thess. 4. ver. 16. so, in that Day, the Earth, and the Works that are therein, shall be burnt up, 2 Pet. chap. 3. ver. 7, 10, 12. compared. From whence we conclude, That as the Faithful shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the Air; so the Wicked and Unbelievers, that remain in the Earth, shall be destroyed by that general Conflagration.

From whence we have a plausible Argument for that, which we have called the *Second Resurrection*; which is the Resurrection of some Men (whoever they be at present) after the Resurrection of the *Righteous*: Because after the Resurrection of the Faithful, and the Destruction of all the rest by Fire, as aforesaid; and not only so, but also a thousand Years after that, Satan is let loose to deceive the Nations. Now, after the general Conflagration, there could be no Nations to be deceived, if there were no Resurrection. They therefore, whom he is to deceive, are those who were raised in the Fifth Verse, as was before said: For, he cannot deceive those of the First Resurrection, for many obvious Reasons.

But farther to assert this Second Resurrection, and to clear such Doubts as may arise concerning it, we shall enquire into these following Particulars.

1. Who those Men are, that shall be raised by it?

2. Why

2. Why the Devil is let loose to deceive them ?

3. Why they are called *the Nations* ?

4. Who is *Gog* and *Magog* ? For, as we shall see by and by, *Gog* and *Magog* must come under this Second Resurrection.

1. And for an Answer to the first Question, *viz.* Who those are, who shall be raised by the second Resurrection ? We must take notice, that the Scriptures do tell us, what it has been our Business in the foregoing Discourse to prove,

1. That *there is not Salvation in any other, but in Jesus Christ alone.*

2. The same Scriptures do tell us, That those Men, who shall be saved by *Jesus Christ*, must believe in him ; that is, they must receive him for their Saviour, and admit the Conditions of that Covenant, which he established in order to their Salvation.

3. The same Scriptures, and our natural Reason do tell us, That *Men cannot believe in him, of whom they have not heard.*

4. And we are assured by Experience, not only, that many *Men*, but that many *Nations* of Men, and that too through *most*, if not *all* Ages of the World, have not heard of *Jesus Christ*.

5. And yet we know by the Scriptures, that *Jesus Christ* came to save *all* Men ; that he died for *all* ; that *God wills not, that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance,*

pentance, and be saved: with much more to the same purpose.

6. And we are assured, That where God *will* the Salvation of *all* Men, and where he has *provided Means* sufficient for the Salvation of *all* Men; that there he *will* not, (we may perhaps say, *cannot*) in Truth, Equity, and Justice, so order Things by his Providence, that *many*, nay, the *most* part of those Men (for whom, as well as for the rest, he provided, and therefore designed Salvation) should be put in *such* Circumstances, and that *without* their own *Fault*, as that it should be utterly impossible for them to come to the Knowledge of their Saviour and his Gospel, and, by consequence, to a Possibility of obtaining Salvation.

Now from these Propositions, so laid down, we do infer,

1. That at *some time or other*, *Jesus Christ* shall be made *known* to *all* Men, before they shall by him be called to Judgment, to give an Account, whether they have received and believed in him, or not.

2. That all those Men, to whom *Jesus Christ* and his Gospel was never made known *before their Death*, shall yet be made acquainted with them *after their Resurrection*.

And in order to our more full Satisfaction in these Conclusions, we take notice farther,

I. That

1. That all, upon whom a final Judgment shall pass, that is, all Men, are by the Scriptures ranged into Two Sorts; Those who shall be saved, and those who shall be damned.

2. That those, with whose Resurrection we are made acquainted, from the Fifth to the Ninth Verse of the Twentieth of *Revelations* inclusive, were raised *after* the Resurrection in the Fourth Verse is *over*; and were raised and gone *before* the Resurrection in the Eleventh, Twelfth, and following Verses does *commence*, which are expressly Resurrections of *Remuneration*; whereas those of this *second* Resurrection, are not, *during* the Time that their Resurrection lasts, called to any *final* Judgment, for any Thing that they had done in *this* Life; but are all that while treated much after the same manner, as Men in this Life are.

And this ~~will~~ yet farther appear, if we consider, that Satan was let loose to tempt them. For,

1. They that are raised to *Happiness* and *Glory* (and so are all they, who have in this Life heard of, and believed in the Saviour) shall *not* after their Resurrection be *tempted* by him. They *have fought the good Fight*, they *have kept the Faith*, they *have finished their Course*; and *from thenceforth* are to *obtain the Crown of Glory laid up for them*.

2. And

2. And all those, who have in this Life been made acquainted with the Saviour, and have *rejected* him, have by that Means put away Salvation from themselves, and therefore shall at their Resurrection be raised to *Condemnation*; and so there will be no Occasion for the Devil to tempt them.

3. To which we may add, That when we are told, that *Satan is let loose to tempt the Nations*, it is implied, that he will tempt them from something that is *good*, to something that is *evil*; for, we know to what End his Temptations do drive, and that he is that *roaring Lion, who goes about, seeking whom he may devour*; that is, that the Business and Design of his Temptations is the Destruction of Souls: And, for that Reason, we may also know, that the *main* Design of his Temptation, or Deceit, in the Text, must be to *seduce* the People there mentioned from *believing* in, and *receiving* the Saviour; and, by consequence, from obtaining Salvation.

From all which we do conclude, That to qualify these People for the *farther* Mercies of the Saviour, over and beyond the *Resurrection*, (which I shall in this Place adventure to call his *general* and *unconditional* Purchase) we may suppose,

1. That the Saviour shall be *then* *tended* to them: For, not having heard of him in *this* Life, they had no Possibility, either of receiving or rejecting him *here*, as the rest of Mankind had.

A a

2. That

2. That after they are, upon their Resurrection, *made acquainted* with the Saviour, they shall be put upon the same Probation, whether they will receive him upon the Conditions of the Gospel; as those were, who had heard of him, and the Gospel-Conditions, in this Life.

3. That if, upon such their Probation, they do receive him; they shall then be in the same happy Condition, in which they *now* are, who *did* receive him in this Life, and who *do* therefore *enjoy* the Happiness of the *first* Resurrection. For, we may reasonably judge, that if upon their Resurrection they did *re-*ceive him, that then they should die *no more*, as *they* who were *alive* at his first Coming (which Coming does still continue) did *not* die, but were *caught up* to him. And perhaps for this Reason the Text does *only* account for the *Death* of those of this Second Resurrection, who *opposed* the Saviour, and *besieged* the beloved City. And if we suppose such a Process in *this* Affair, (as indeed the Circumstances seem to allow us more than barely to suppose it) it will upon such Supposition be found exactly to answer and agree with the Proceedings at the *first* Coming of our Saviour to raise the Righteous. For, as then they, who believed in him, and were *alive* in the Earth, did *not* die at all, but were *caught up to meet the Lord in the Air*; so here, those, who upon their Resurrection *received* and
believed

believed in the Saviour then made known to them, shall *not* die, but shall be *taken* to the Lord, and so shall escape that *Fire* from Heaven, which will destroy all the rest, who *besiege* the beloved City: Just as the Righteous at the beginning of this our Saviour's Coming were *caught up* to meet the Lord in the Air, and so *escaped* the general Conflagration, which ensued.

1. Now, from all that has been said, the Answer to the first Question will be, That they, who shall be raised by that, which we have called the Second Resurrection, are all those, who never had had the Offer of a Saviour made to them in this Life.

2. From which we may gain an easie Answer to the second Question, which is, Why the Devil is let loose to deceive them?

The Reason of which is, Because *they* are to undergo the *same* Probation, upon the Offer of the Saviour to them, which *those* underwent, who in this Life *had* the same Offer. For, it is just and equitable, that they should undergo the *same* Trial with those of the *first* Resurrection, for this Reason; Because all Mankind having by Sin become voluntary Subjects to Satan; it is neither agreeable to the Divine Justice, nor indeed to the Rules of Reason in general, to rescue any of them from such Subjection, *without* their own voluntary Consent. For, in order to their *Return* to their Original Subjection

to God, it is necessary, that they become *good* and *holy*: And in order to their becoming so, it is necessary (and that too in the Nature of the Thing) that they be *willing* to become so. As therefore the *Devil* first brought them *off from* their Subjection to God, to that of himself, by persuading them to *consent*. (that is, to be willing) to the Revolt; so God brings them *back again*, only by persuading them to be *willing* to return. For, if on one side or the other, either God or the Devil should *force* or *compel* them to their respective Subjection, they could by such Force neither be made *good* nor *bad*; that is, they could not become Subjects to either; because there can be no moral Goodness or Badness without the Consent of his Will, who is good or bad. Since therefore God (having made Man a Free Agent, and so, capable of Moral Goodness) did not force them to *continue good*, when the Devil first *tempted* them to be *bad*; and so did not hinder the Devil from tempting them to be bad at first; neither will he, for the same Reason, hinder the Devil from tempting them to *continue* so, no, not when he himself does offer to them a Saviour. So that the *Offer* of a Saviour by God, and his *Invitations* and *Persuasions* of Men to *receive* such Saviour, on the *one* Hand; and the Devil's *Dis-suasions* and *Temptations* of them from receiving such Saviour on the *other* Hand, being
in

in some measure a Counterpoise to each other; the Receiving or Refusing of the Saviour becomes the Act and Deed of him, to whom he is tendred; and so, in Right and Justice, the consequential Benefits of such Receiving, and the consequential Mischiefs of such Refusal, shall become his just Portion.

Tho' therefore the Devil shall not be suffered to tempt those of the First Resurrection any more, because they had already baffled and overcome his Temptations in this Life; and so, notwithstanding such his Temptations, had received the Saviour on the Gospel-Conditions: Yet because the Case of those of the Second Resurrection is, upon such their Resurrection, and the Offer, of the Saviour then to them, just the *same*, as was the Case of the *First* in *this* Life; therefore Satan shall be let loose to tempt *them* after their Resurrection, as he was to tempt the *others* in *this* Life.

God therefore, by raising them from the Dead, did in a Saviour *do* that for them, which it was utterly *impossible* for them to do for themselves; but still leaves them to do for *themselves* what they *can* do; tho' (as we may suppose) not without such Assistance as may be sufficient (if they be not wanting to themselves) to enable them to conquer the Devil's Temptations.

3. The Third Question is, Why the Devil is said to be let loose to deceive the (Nations?)

In order to the Resolution of which, we must take notice, that upon the Second Resurrection, there was now Two Sorts of People upon the Face of the Earth; whereof the first are the Inhabitants of the *New Jerusalem*, the beloved City. Now, as under *Moses's* Law, the *Israelites*, who were the People of God, (whose chief City was *Jerusalem*, the Place where God had settled his more Solemn Worship, and his more Especial Abode;) I say, as the *Israelites* are opposed to the *Gentiles*, -that is, to the rest of the World, in the Scriptures; so, in allusion to that, (for, the Church of the *Jews* was a Type of the Church of *Christ*;) the Faithful in *Christ* are in several Places of the *New Testament* called *the Israel of God*. So in the Sixth to the *Galatians*, ver. 16. the Apostle prays for *Peace and Mercy* upon some *Christians* there mentioned, *and upon the whole Israel of God*. And when he tells us, in the Eleventh to the *Romans*, ver. 26. That *all Israel shall be saved*, it is evident, by the Context, that he means, all, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, who shall believe in the Saviour. And therefore *Christ* calls *Nathanael*, in the First Chapter of *St. John*, *an Israelite indeed*, (that is, a true good Man) *in whom there is no guile*. Those then of the *First Resurrection*, in the Twentieth

tieth of *Revelations*, are there to be esteemed the *Israel* of God, or the People of *Israel*. But those of the *second* Resurrection are therefore called *the Nations*, because, upon their Resurrection, they shall stand in several Circumstances to those of the First Resurrection, as the *Gentiles* did to the *Jews* before, and at the first Promulgation of the Gospel. For, *Salvation was of the Jews*; and St. Paul tells them, (and so our Saviour appointed) in the Thirteenth of the *Acts*, ver. 46. *It was necessary, that the Word of God should have first been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, &c. lo! we turn to the Gentiles.* But still the first Converts to *Christianity* were *Israelites*, and the *Gentiles* were added to the Church afterwards. Now, we must take notice, that the People, who are in the Eighth Verse of the Twentieth of *Revelations* called *the Nations*, who (as appears by the Context) are those of the Second Resurrection, are styled in the Original *ἔθνη*, which in the *New Testament* is translated sometimes the *Gentiles*, and sometimes the *Nations*: The *Nations*, in the Verse quoted in the *Revelations*; the *Gentiles*, in the Thirteenth of *Acts*, quoted before. Now, from these Things, so premised, we take notice,

1. That the People of this *second* Resurrection are notoriously, in the Twentieth of *Revelations*, distinguished from those of the *first*, much after the same manner, as the

Gentiles in this World were from the *Jews*: The *one* being called the *Nations* or *Gentiles*; the *other*, the *Saints*, or the *Holy People*, the *Inhabitants* of the *New Jerusalem*, or the *beloved City*. So that, as the *Jews* were first called in *this* World, and *after* them the *Gentiles*; who, before such their Call, had no Prophecies, nor any Promises, concerning the *Messiah*, the *Christ*; and so were utter *Strangers* to any *Knowledge* of him, and, by consequence, *incapable* of any *Faith* in him: So the *Israel* of God are first raised in the *next* World, do enjoy the *Promises* in the *Messiah*, and do *inhabit* what the Apostle calls *Jerusalem*, which is *above*. And after them, *those* who had been utter *Strangers* and *Aliens* from the *Commonwealth* of *Israel*, the *Gentiles*, are raised, have the Saviour the *Messiah* made *known* to them, and so are put into a Capacity of entering into his *Rest*, as the *Israel* of God had done *before* them.

2. That those *Nations* or *Gentiles* were *capable* of being seduced by Satan; nay, that Multitudes of them *were* so. By which we may understand, (as we have observed before) that they were seduced from something that was good: Nay, it is evident from the Context, that they were seduced to *resist* and *oppose* the Saviour, because they were seduced to *besiege* that City, where the Saviour was *King*.

3. Since

3. Since they were seduced from something that was Good; and since it is expressed, that by such their Seduction they were engaged to oppose the Saviour; it is (at least) implied, that they were seduced from *following* him, (as his People of the *first* Resurrection had done, and now did) and from *putting* themselves under his *Government*.

4. Because their Multitudes are reckoned very great, *ver.* 8. & 9. we may the rather conjecture, that they were the People, who in this Life had *never* heard of the Saviour, whose Numbers must needs be exceeding great. And yet,

5. It is not to be thought, that, tho' *many* of them were seduced, yet that *all* of them were so. Nay, it is more rational to think, that it will be much the same with them then, as it was with those who had heard of the Saviour in this World, where *many* are called, but *few* are chosen.

4. Now this great Multitude of the Second Resurrection, who shall be seduced from receiving the Saviour, (tho' tendred to them) and who upon such their Seduction shall oppose him and his People, I take to be *Gog* and *Magog*: For, the Description of them *here*, does well enough agree with that Description which we have of *Gog* and *Magog* in the *Thirty eighth* Chapter of *Ezekiel*. Let us try, by comparing them a little together.

Rev.

Rev. chap. 20.

*Ver. 8. The Nations
that are in the four
Quarters of the Earth,
Gog and Magog.*

Ezek. chap. 38.

*Ver. 2. Gog in the
Land of Magog, rec-
koned up there.*

*Ver. 5. Persia, E-
thiopia, Libya.*

*Ver. 6. Gomer and
the house of Togarmah.*

Now *Persia* was on the *East* of *Jerusalem*; *Ethiopia* and *Libya* on the *South*; *Gomer* on the *West*: For *Gomer* was a Son of *Japhet*, [See *Gen. 10.*] and the *Western Parts* were inhabited by the *Posterity of Japhet*. And *Togarmah*, tho' a Son of *Gomer*, and by consequence of the *Posterity of Japhet*, yet in the very Text is called *Togarmah* of the *North Quarters*, perhaps a Colony planted towards that Quarter. So that *Gog* and *Magog* are in *both* Texts said to come up against *Jerusalem* from the *four Quarters* of the *Earth*; and therefore so far they agree.

*V. 8. The number of
whom is as the Sand of
the Sea.*

*V. 9. And they went
up on the breadth of
the Earth.*

*V. 9. They come like
a Storm, and are like
a Cloud over the Land,*

*and many People with
them.*

With other such like Descriptions, whereby it appears, that thy agree in their *Numbers*.

Rev.

Rev. chap. 20.

Ezek. chap. 38.

V. 9. *They compassed the Camp of the Saints about, and the beloved City.*

V. 18. *At the same time, when Gog shall come against the Land of Israel.*

V. 16. *Thou shalt come against my People Israel; it shall be in the latter days.*

Gog and Magog came up against the beloved City in the latter Days, as is evident in the Context.

V. 9. *Fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them.*

V. 22. *I will rain upon him, and upon his Bands, and upon the many People that are with him, an overflowing Rain, and great Hailstones, Fire, and Brimstone.*

By all which we may understand in general, that the Nations, which on all Sides came against and destroyed the Nation and People of the Jews, seem to be called by the Spirit, in Ezekiel, Gog and Magog: For, the Universality of the Description seems to imply all Nations that contributed to their Destruction.

And tho' the Prophecy might directly and immediately regard only the State of the Jewish Nation then, when they were led Captive to Babylon; yet it may, for all that, have a farther Prospect to their utter Extirpation, when

when their *whole* Nation was rooted up, after our Saviour's Crucifixion.

And then, as God punished the *Amorites*, the *Moabites*, those of Mount *Seir*, the *Edomites*, the *Philistins*, the *Tyrians*, the *Sidonians*, the *Egyptians*, the *Affyrians*, for their Cruelties to the *Jews*, [See *Ezek. chap. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.*] and afterwards the *Romans* for theirs: All which Nations, and perhaps some others, (the *Romans* excepted) are summed up under the Name of *Gog* and *Magog*, in the Thirty eighth and Thirty ninth Chapters: So the Destruction of those, who were seduced under the Second Resurrection, may be there described Allegorically, by the Destruction of *Gog* and *Magog*: That is, the Destruction of *those*, who shall then *reject* the Saviour, and *oppose* his People, after he is tendred to them upon the *second* Resurrection, may (because of the Parity of the Case) be accounted for in *such* Terms, in which the Enemies of the *Jewish* Church (the Type of the *Christian* Church) are recorded to have been *destroyed* by the Prophecies of the *Old Testament*.

Gog and *Magog* then in the Twentieth of *Revelations*, are those People of the Second Resurrection, who having been seduced by Satan to refuse and oppose the Saviour, and them who, dying in him, rose first; are, for such their Refusal and Opposition, destroyed by the Vengeance of Heaven.

So much for the Second Resurrection.

But before we quite leave it, I must remark, That the Reasons why there are not in the Scriptures any more express Revelations of a future Probation of those, upon their Resurrection, who knew nothing of a Saviour in this World, seem to be these Two.

1. Because their Resurrection, and Probation upon such Resurrection, neither does, nor can concern those, who *have* the Scriptures: For, by those Scriptures *they* may come to the Knowledge of the Saviour in this Life, which is as much as concerns *them*. And,

2. Had this Resurrection and Probation been *put* into the Scriptures, yet those who had *not* those Scriptures in *this* Life, could, for that Reason, have known *nothing* of the Matter in *this* Life; and so, as to *them*, as well as to the *others*, it had been put into the Scriptures in *vain*.

But yet, when the Account which the Scriptures give us of God's Dealing with Mankind, draws towards a *Conclusion*; that is, when it comes to that Period, where their Case *ends*, who have in this Life *had* the Revelation of a Saviour, and where their Case *begins*, who shall have such Revelation *after* their Resurrection: I say, when the Scriptures do come to that Point, they do by the Account that they then give us of the thousand Years, of the City of the Saints, of Gog and Magog, &c. compared with some
other

other Texts, give us some duskie Glimpses of such an Oeconomy and Proceeding.

3. The Third and Last Resurrection is accounted for in the Eleventh and following Verses, to the end of the Chapter: In which we have an Account of the Last Judgment, by the Description of the great White Throne, and him that sat upon it, &c. And this Resurrection I take to be only the Resurrection of *Gog and Magog*, and of all others, who had *refused* the Saviour in this Life, as *Gog and Magog* did after their Resurrection.

1. For, first, The Faithful (in this Life) were raised, in the Fourth Verse, and died *no more*. *All* then that were raised at the *first* Resurrection, I take to be *one Part* of those, who were written in the Book of *Life*. For, tho' the Description of those raised in the Fourth Verse, may not seem, and is not thought by some to extend to *all* the Faithful in this Life, but only to *Martyrs*: Yet, because several other Texts do assure us, that *the Dead in Christ shall rise* first; therefore, by the warrant of *those* Texts, in conjunction with the *Fourth* Verse, I do extend the first Resurrection to *all* who believed in *this World*. Besides, They who did *not* receive the Mark of the Beast, nor of his Image, in the Fourth Verse, and they that *did*; I say, this Division does include all Believers and Unbelievers in *this World*: And it is notorious, that so it does through the whole Account

count that this Book of the *Revelations* gives us of the *Beast* and his *Followers*, and of those who *refused* the Mark of the *Beast*.

2. And we have already surmised, That some of *those* who are raised by the Second Resurrection, shall *believe* and be *saved*, and that too *before* the great White Throne is set. And indeed it is not to be thought, that the Saviour should be made *known* to them, unless *some* of them were to have *received*, and *believed* in him. And therefore I do entirely *exclude both* these Sorts of *Believers*; that is, in other Words, I do exclude *all*, who shall be *saved*, out of this Third and *last Resurrection*.

And he who shall well weigh and consider the Account that is given of the Great Judgment mentioned in the Eleventh and following Verses, will (I believe) be satisfied, that it is only the Judgment passed upon *Unbelievers*. For, as the *Books*, that were *opened*, are mentioned as distinct from the Book of *Life*; so it is expressly said, that they were judged out of the *Books*. If therefore the Book of *Life* did contain in it *all* that were *saved*, as most notoriously so it did; for, besides the Import of the *Phrase*, the *Text* tells us, that *whosoever* was not found written in the Book of *Life*, was cast into the Lake of *Fire*, ver. 15. Then those who were judged out of the *Books*, distinct from the Book of *Life*, can only be the *Unbelievers* and the *Reprobate*.
The

The *third* and *last* Resurrection therefore does only belong to *such*. From which I would remark, That God is slow in the Execution, as of *other* his Judgments; so more notoriously in this his *last* and heavy Judgment; because we find, that he has assigned the very *last* Place to *this*, among all his Dealings with the Children of Men.

F I N I S.

